

"A greater FOOL you might by possibility have chosen; for you might have got a representative from the *lunatic hospitals*. If real life afforded you nothing equal to him as BULLY AND COWARD, Shakespeare or Ben Jonson might, in the character of *Pistol* or *Bobadil*, have supplied something to satisfy you. But as LIAR, as *brazen, unblushing, malignant liar*, your choice sets at defiance all that the world ever saw, either in real life or in fiction."—REGISTER, 9th APRIL, 1831.

## BOROUGHMONGERS AND HUNT.

TO THE  
PEOPLE OF PRESTON.

Kensington, April 19, 1831.

MY EXCELLENT FRIENDS,

I VERY soon perceived that your COCK would join the boroughmongers. I always *thought* it; but he had hardly begun to *open his mouth* in Parliament when I was sure that he would do it on the very first opportunity. The COCK, however, has so *little power* that he cannot do a *great deal* of harm. "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak." The effect of the STUFF, reported to have been made by him on Tuesday, the 12th instant, has made me laugh. This STUFF has set the whole country in an uproar against the Cock. Every-body is "*disgusted*" and "*shocked*" by this STUFF; but I recollect that every-body could be *quiet enough* while this fellow was for years putting forth LIES AGAINST ME, and lies, too, much more infamous than those now brought against him. Mr. PRENTICE, a Manchester editor, is now forced to accuse this fellow of *lying*; but this same Mr. PRENTICE could, very coolly, for a year or two, *hand about* this fellow's atrocious lies against me. However, I excuse Mr. Prentice, and hope that it will teach him to be more cautious for the future.

In the last *Register*, page 141, is the STUFF which this fellow made on the

12th instant, and in which he asserted, that the people, all over the country, had *changed their opinions about the Reform Bill*, and were now *opposed to it*. This STUFF was taken, next day, and printed, and circulated, by thousands, *by the Boroughmongers and their agents!* So, my friends, I was right, you see! I told you, long ago, that he was *doing their work* in the best possible way. I told you, that *you had sent to Parliament a more zealous enemy of reform than any of the boroughs had*. You must be well satisfied of this now. On the 18th instant the following took place in the House of Commons. It is worthy of every-body's attention, but particularly of *yours*. From you he got his *power* to do that which he has done. Read, with attention, the whole of this debate; see what a figure your Cock makes; then *look at one another for a little while*, and see what a figure *you yourselves make!* After the debate, you will find some other *pretty matter!*

Mr. HUME said that it was very natural that a corporate body, having a monopoly of the election for their borough, should wish to keep it. It was not, however, on the petition which had just been presented that he rose to speak. But it having been stated, and generally circulated, that a large class of persons in Lancashire were opposed to the Parlia-

mentary Reform Bill, he rose to say that he was authorized to state, that so far from any opposition to that measure, there was an unanimous feeling throughout Lancashire in favour of the bill, which was hailed as a great and important boon to the people. (Hear, hear, hear.) At every public dinner, even at those of which the honorable Member for Preston had partook, the health of his Majesty's Ministers and success to the plan were toasted. If there was a single individual present opposed to the measure, it was, perhaps, the hon. Member for Preston. (Hear, hear, hear.) It was of the utmost consequence that that important body, the operatives of Lancashire and elsewhere, should not be supposed averse to the plan because they did not immediately participate in its provisions. They felt that their character was affected by the imputation; they were anxious that it should be known that such was their feeling, and if it were necessary to prove the fact, meetings would be held for that purpose from one end of Lancashire to the other. It was true that attempts had been made to dissatisfy them with the measure. Questions had been asked—if the bill contained all they wanted?—if they would not rather have had universal suffrage? Why let that question be put to him (Mr. Hume), and his answer would be that he would rather have universal suffrage. (Hear, hear, hear.) But was he to set up his opinion on that point against the united opinions of that House and the country? That would indeed be dictation. But, although the bill did not comprehend universal suffrage, it was so valuable and important a measure that he (Mr. Hume) should be most unworthy of his seat in that House if he did not support it. He believed it could be proved to demonstration, that the statement which had been made by the hon. Member for Preston, and at which the right honourable and learned Gentlemen under him were so rejoiced, of the disinclination of the working classes in Lancashire and elsewhere to the bill, was exceedingly unfair towards them. It was his duty to state that, as far as he was informed, they had no feeling whatever of the kind.

MR. LYTTLETON said, that he also had been desired to give the flattest contradiction to the assertion that the working classes were not, to a man, favourable to the Reform Bill (Hear, hear, hear.) He believed that on no occasion had a greater feeling of unanimity existed among them. It was impossible that what passed there (in the House of Commons) should not find its way out of doors. With reference to the statement which had been made in the House by the hon. Member for Preston of what had taken place at Durlaston, he had received a letter from a highly respectable magistrate and clergyman, parts of which he would take the liberty of reading to the House. The hon. Gentleman proceeded to read to the following effect:—"I saw yesterday, by appointment, several very respectable inhabitants of Durlaston, who

heard what Mr. Hunt said there. They declared that they did not hear from any one any-thing like opposition to the bill, nor did they believe that one inhabitant of Durlaston objected to the bill. On the contrary, they stated that the members of the political union at Durlaston (the hon. Gentleman said he regretted to use the expression) were disgusted with Mr Hunt's proceedings. Mr. Hunt asked some of the inhabitants, 'Do you return any members near here?' They answered 'At Coventry and Tamworth.' 'How far are you from Coventry?'—'Thirty miles.' 'How far from Tamworth?'—'Twenty miles.' 'Go, then,' said Mr. Hunt, 'twenty thousand in a body, and do not let those places return the same members that they returned at the last election, but make them return such as will second me in the House. (A laugh.) Take hold of the members and try to persuade them. If that will not do, squeeze them hard; if that will not do, apply the tourniquet to them, and see if that will have any effect.' (Hear, hear, hear! and No, no! from Mr. Hunt.) He (Mr. Lyttleton) would not positively say that the hon. Member for Preston said what he had just read, but he was authorised to declare that he had said it, and he should believe the statement until he heard it flatly contradicted. The letter proceeded to say that the writer had been at Birmingham the day before, and that he had there received a similar contradiction of the statements of the hon. Member for Preston with respect to that place. He (Mr. Lyttleton) had received three or four other letters, all to the same effect. The fact of the feeling of the political union at Durlaston being the reverse of what it had been alleged to be by the hon. Member for Preston, was proved by the hand-bill preparatory to their dinner. It was to the following effect.—"Full, free, and fair representation the birth-right of Englishmen. The members of the Durlaston Political Union will dine together at the King's Head on Monday April 4th, to celebrate the triumph of the glorious cause of Reform in the hands of our beloved Sovereign and of his enlightened Ministers." (Hear, hear, hear.)

MR. HUNT said, that in the first place, as to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Middlesex, he could, perhaps, in some measure confirm it. But as to what had been stated by the hon. Member for Staffordshire, he had no hesitation in declaring that it was mainly unfounded. The manner in which he happened to be at the Durlaston Meeting was this. Being at Birmingham, on his way to Preston, he was invited to go to the Meeting of the county at Warwick; but having no property in that county he declined the invitation, and determined to stay at Birmingham. Two of the members of the Political Union of that place—Mr. Weston, a highly-respectable individual, and another—told him that they were going to Durlaston, and that if he liked they would take him thither in their carriage and bring him back. Accordingly, he went; and in



consequence of his presence, instead of fifty, the number for which the dinner was ordered, three hundred attended. (A laugh.) This accession of numbers certainly occasioned rather short commons. He was invited to address the party, which, after there had been a discussion of about two hours in length, on the bill, he did. He certainly put questions to the persons present; they being principally working men, and not persons having houses of ten pounds a year, qualifying them to vote under the new measure. He admitted that he put leading questions to them; and he appealed to the hon. Member for Staffordshire whether it was not usual even in Courts of Justice to put leading questions for the purpose of eliciting the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. He asked them if they were contented with the proposed system of representation? A large proportion of them said, they were not. He asked them whether, as they were not allowed to choose their own representatives, they were satisfied with delegating that power to individuals holding houses of 10*l.* a year? They said, certainly not. After dinner he was invited to address a great multitude, assembled partly to hear the Members of the Political Union of Birmingham, and partly to hear him. He was told that they amounted to 10,000 persons. He had formerly stated to the House, that in the first instance the meetings of the people were unanimous in favour of the bill. He had even said that they were running mad upon it. The hon. and learned Member for Boroughbridge had called the bill the Russell Purge. That might be the name for it as respected the boroughmongers, but it must have another name as it respected the people. The noble Lord had knocked off a hundred and twenty Members for boroughs, had put them in an oven, and had converted them into powder, which he had administered to the people, and which should be called Boroughmongering and Love Powder. By that powder the people had been deluded. But now, as far as he had had an opportunity of ascertaining the opinions of the people of Lancashire, there were many parts of the bill of which they did not approve. For himself, he approved of knocking off the boroughs; but he always contended for giving the right of representation to the whole people; and he had given notice that, when the Bill went into the Committee, it was his intention to move that those who were excluded from the elective franchise should be exempted from paying taxes, and from serving in the militia. He had merely put the question to the people, if they gained anything by the bill? their answer was, No. On asking them what they expected to gain by it? they said, nothing whatever. It was the same at Manchester. The hon. Member for Middlesex said, that wherever he (Mr. Hunt) had dined at public meetings in Lancashire the health of his Majesty's Ministers was drunk. In no instance had he dined at any of the public meetings alluded to by

the hon. Gentleman. He had been invited to an evening party, where there was nothing to eat (a laugh), and there certainly the health of his Majesty's Ministers had been drunk. Here, said he, is a Petition signed by 4000 out of the 7000 electors of Preston in three days, and this confirms every part of my statement. He then stated he had letters from all parts of the country, as well as the hon. Member for Staffordshire, and all these letters denounced the measure. Of these he would read one, which came from Paisley, notwithstanding the assertion of the hon. Member for Kircudbright, that all Scotland was in favour of the bill. This letter came from the Chairman of a Reform Meeting held in Paisley, and stated the feeling of the country might be appreciated from the fact of the proportion between the number of qualified and unqualified householders. Throughout Scotland the proportion of the qualified to the unqualified was 1 to 10½ or 11; in Edinburgh it was as 1 to 3; in Glasgow as 1 to 4½; in Aberdeen as 1 to 7; in Paisley as 1 to 14; in Dundee as 1 to 6; and in Leith as 1 to 4½. Was this, he asked, the free and equal representation which they were told the people was to have? For the hon. Member for Middlesex he entertained a very great respect; but he did not consider him half so useful as he was formerly, since he had become a Ministerial Member. (Hear, and laughter.) He was now content with recording his objection to a vote, whereas, formerly, he would have insisted upon a division. (Hear, and laughter.) In fact he was much better as an Opposition than as a Ministerial Member. (Hear, and laughter.) Still, however, he thought the Ministry had gained a great deal in having so industrious and laborious and honest a supporter. (Hear, and laughter.) There was a speech of his to which allusion had been made—he meant that which had given so much displeasure at one side of the House, and given such satisfaction at another—that he understood the hon. Members on his side had it printed. (Cheers from the Treasury Benches.) This speech, too, had been received with great disapprobation by the Press. He had got a great trouncing from the Press. (Hear, and laughter.) And what he would call the politicians of London were very much displeased with him. It was, he was well informed, up to the last fortnight, the custom at all the public-houses, smoking-rooms, and other places of nightly meeting, frequently to drink his health; but since he had made that speech, in every instance, and in every house, a vote of censure had been passed against him. But though these votes had been recorded against him, and although the Press had attacked him, should he, as the Representative of a free people, be afraid to express his conscientious opinion?—No. (Cheers.) As for the Press, he asserted there had been a conspiracy of the Papers in favour of the bill. He hoped hon. Members and the Press would understand him. He said there was a conspiracy—not of the Papers with the

**Ministry**—but of the Papers amongst themselves. Such was the popularity of the measure among the buyers of Newspapers, that they could not have sold their papers if they had not advocated it. (Cheers from the Treasury benches.) Now he received cheers from the other side of the House. (Hear, and laughter.) It was said that he had sold himself—and this not to him who was in favour and place. He should be glad to know to whom it was said he did sell himself! And he could tell the House and all the hon. Members of it, there was but one price by which he could be bought—there was that one, and but that one way of gaining him—it was by giving representation to the whole people. He hoped more time would have been allowed for the presentation of Petitions; and as he could not present it, he begged leave to read a short extract from one in his possession. (Oh, oh!) There was in this petition authority which would bear him out. (Oh, oh!) He wished the House and the Press to understand that when he spoke of the people he spoke of the whole people, and not of those merely who were to be represented; and he had no hesitation in declaring it to be his honest and decided opinion, that the unrepresented portion of the community were dissatisfied, and would be still more so when they had time for reflection. He would read an extract from *The Leeds Patriot*, which afforded an honourable exception to the conduct of the Press in general towards him. (Oh! question, question.) The hon. Member then reverted to Preston, and said he was bound to admit that another Petition had been got up in Preston, and was in the hands of his colleague; but the Meeting from which it emanated was held in a room that could not hold more than 600 persons, and not one-fifth of the electors were present. He added, that the Chairman refused to put a Motion adverse to the bill. He then read the extract from *The Leeds Patriot*, which stated that the hon. Member for Preston had done honour to himself and his constituents (hear, and great laughter) by expressing the genuine opinion of the working classes, now that they had had time to consider that the bill was decidedly not popular amongst the producers of the country's wealth, and that it was evident the Press had combined to misrepresent, or suppress the opinion of the hon. Member for Preston, in the same manner formerly complained of upon the part of Mr. O'Connell. (Laughter.) He (Mr. Hunt) did not complain of the Press. Everything could not be printed, and he had his fair share. But it was not the first time he had the whole Press against him, even without one bare exception, because he advocated the same principles which he did then. In conclusion, he repeated his assertions respecting the unpopularity of the bill with the working-classes, adding at the same time, that he had no doubt it would be carried.

Mr. Alderman WAITHMAN stated, that he had been entrusted with a petition from the

Spitalfields Weavers in favour of that bill, and that he had received a Deputation from them, by which he was informed that they had held such an opinion of Mr. Hunt, that it was their intention to have confided the petition to his charge, but that his speech upon the Reform Question, delivered some time since, had filled them with indignation. The petitioners, he remarked, were all operatives, and not entitled to enjoy the franchise under the bill. As to the hon. Member for Preston himself, he considered him the best friend to reform, with no good intention, however, on his own part, but from his misrepresentations of that House and of his Majesty's Ministers. The fact was, the hon. Member had opened the eyes of the people.

Lord STANLEY said he rose to remark that the hon. Member for Preston had returned no answer to the question put by the hon. Member for Staffordshire. He had himself asked the question in private to-day, whether Mr. Hunt had, at Manchester, used the language attributed to him respecting the Wigan election, and he was told that Mr. Hunt had not used exactly the words printed in the papers, but he had said something very like it. The words attributed to the hon. Member about the Wigan election, were as follows:—"The first day of the Wigan election, let every man in Manchester, between the ages of 15 and 45, march over to Wigan, to accompany Mr. Potter, to the number of 20 or 30,000 men, and he would have them go and exercise what he called a constitutional influence over the electors of Wigan. 'If you meet a voter (said Mr. Hunt), say to some ten or twelve of you, take care of him, and see if you can't persuade him to vote for Potter. Use kind entreaties; and if these fail, I would advise them to take him by the arm, and give him a gentle squeeze, and let one take hold of his other arm, (and I know you Lancashire men give something like a feeling squeeze when you like), and if he still refuses, I would not say I would pull his arms off, but I would very near do it. That is what you are called upon to do, and my opinion is that if you don't do it, you will never get this Reform or any other.'"—He asked if this or any thing like it was fit language to be used by a Member of that House? Again, about the expected election at Manchester, the hon. Member had been reported to say—"He had been asked, supposing the Reform Bill should pass, who were the people of Manchester going to send? [A voice from the crowd: 'Hugh Birley,' accompanied by groans and cries of 'No, no.'] He had been told of him before; but on his expressing a desire to know who he was, 'Don't you know,' said some one, 'that's Captain Birley, who came up to the hustings in August, 1819.' 'What!' exclaimed Mr. Hunt, 'will the people of Manchester send a master-butcher of Peterloo to represent them in Parliament? (No, never.) Those who were not ten-pounders would, he thought, take care of that. If they could be guilty of such an atrocity,



he would retire from public life, and never enter Lancashire again; and he would tell them that, were he a Manchester man, rather than submit to it, he would lay half Manchester in ruins. Instead of having fourteen lives lost, he would have half the blood in Manchester spilt before he would submit to such a degradation." (Cries of Oh, oh!) He had asked the hon. Member if he had used this language, and he replied that, generally speaking, it was much exaggerated; but, in answer to a particular question respecting the portion of his speech which referred to Manchester, he acknowledged that he had said something very like it. He (Lord Stanley) declared that if the hon. Member had said anything like it, he had disgraced himself and his country. (Hear, hear, hear.) He begged pardon for wasting the time of the House with reference to a speech delivered out of doors, but he felt it his duty to do so. He then proceeded to allude to the Turnpike Bill, upon the conduct of which Mr. Hunt had commented in his speech, and affirmed, that, upon a small foundation of truth, the hon. Member had raised a strange structure, which he could not attribute either to mistake or misrepresentation. He farther stated that he was informed, that when a person asked in the crowd where was Wood, Mr. Hunt, shrugging his shoulders, replied, "Aye, indeed, where was Wood when he ought to be attending to your interests," when the hon. Member well knew that Mr. Wood had attended on the committee.

After a few words from Mr. PEARSE, which were not audible in the gallery—

Mr. HUNT stated, that he had told the noble Lord the expressions in the paper from which he had quoted were much exaggerated, but that he might see something very like what he should say in *The Manchester Times*. He had omitted to answer the hon. Member for Staffordshire's question. He had now to say that the statement in the Clergyman's letter was a gross exaggeration. He did ask the people if they would not go in great bodies and exercise a constitutional influence (loud laughter), by endeavouring to prevail on the electors to vote for the friend of the people, and he had spoken of a gentle squeeze (continued laughter), but all that about the tourniquet and taking off their arms was gross exaggeration. He denied that he had ever spoken of Mr. Wood except in terms of the utmost respect.

Mr. LYTTLETON affirmed that he was authorised by the gentleman who wrote to him to state, that a number of respectable tradesmen were willing to verify the statement on oath.

The petition was then laid on the table.

While the debate was going on, on Tuesday, Mr. CHARLES JONES, of Birmingham, who appears to have been in the gallery, and to have heard HUNT's assertions, went to an Hotel in the

neighbourhood, and wrote the following letter to Mr. LYTTLETON. Mr. JONES is a member of Birmingham; and, observe, this is the gentleman who, as Mr. MITCHELL told us, was making the Preston medals free of expense, all but the weight of metal. Read his letter:—

"Fendall's Hotel, New Palace Yard,  
"18th April, 1831.

"SIR,—I have just heard with *indignant surprise*, that Mr. HUNT has this evening declared from his seat in the House of Commons, that the Birmingham Political Union is dissatisfied with the Ministerial measure of Reform. I beg leave unequivocally to state, as one of that body, and as a Member of the Council, that the Birmingham Political Union is enthusiastically in favour of this great national measure; and that at a recent Public Meeting, convened by the Council, and attended by 15,000 persons, they unanimously expressed their full and grateful approbation of it, and their deliberate determination to support, by every means in their power, his Majesty's Ministers in carrying it into effect. I am glad that I have the opportunity of giving *an immediate contradiction to so injurious a misrepresentation*. You are at full liberty to make any use you may think proper of this letter.

"I am, Sir,

"Your most obedient servant,  
"CHAS. JONES.

"To E. J. Lyttleton, Esq., M.P."

Next comes a letter from Mr. RICHARD POTTER, of Manchester, the very gentleman that he insulted at Manchester by recommending thousands of the people there to go to Wigan and nearly pull the voters' arms off to make them vote for this very Mr. POTTER. This is Mr. POTTER's letter to Mr. HUME:

"TO J. HUME, ESQ., M.P.

"DEAR SIR,—I take the liberty of writing you, in consequence of the extraordinary statement of Mr. Hunt on Tuesday night, relative to the feeling of the Lancashire people on the Reform Bill.

"He says, that during his late visit into Lancashire, he found the people generally opposed to the Ministerial Reform Bill, NOW I BEG TO SAY THERE NEVER WAS SO INFAMOUS A FALSEHOOD UTTERED IN THE HOUSE OR ANYWHERE ELSE. The opinions of the inhabitants are most decidedly in favour of it; in proof of which I might mention that public meetings have been held in every principal town in the country, and in nearly all the villages, at all which the most unqualified approbation was given to the measure. I have been invited to attend several of those meetings, and can testify as to the disposition of the people.

"I will venture to say, that if the inhabitants of Manchester were to meet to-morrow, the same feeling would prevail, and it is a shameful libel on the Lancashire people for Hunt to have stated what he did; but his speech at Peterloo was in the most extravagant style imaginable; he said all he could to set the people against the Reform Bill, but without effect.

"We think he must be sanctioned by some of the Ultra-Tories, and that they are making use of him to revile the bill; but I do hope he will be put down, and not allowed to stand up and so grossly insult the people of England.

"I remain, with great respect,

"Yours, &c.,

"RICHARD POTTER."

Now comes a falsehood still more audacious, though not more atrocious. If you look into the last *Register*, top of page 166, you will find that he stated, in his speech at Manchester, that Sir CHARLES WOLESELEY, when he (HUNT) came out of Ilchester jail, came to him at Brookes's Coffee House, in London, on behalf of the Whigs, and said that, if he would join them as Sir ROBERT WILSON did, they would subscribe twelve thousand pounds for him (HUNT), and put him into Parliament; and that he (HUNT) spurned the offer. In page 156 of the same *Register*, I said that I was sure that this was a

horrible lie. Now, my friends, pray read the following letter from Sir CHARLES WOLESELEY.

*Brighton, 12 o'clock, Saturday.*

"SIR,

"Your *Register* of this week has been just put into my hands; I am in nowise surprised at any-thing the MEMBER FOR PRESTON may say or do! The designation you have given of the assertion in his speech at Manchester is so just, and would be so sufficient upon all ordinary occasions as to leave it unnecessary for me to say more; but in order, that 'THE PEOPLE' shall know the man, it is requisite that I do say more; and that shall be done the moment I arrive from Paris in about ten days, and if I do not 'floor' that 'honourable' Member, my name is not.

"C. WOLESELEY.

"P.S.—I am on the point of sailing by the steam-packet for Dieppe, or I would have gone to work instantly. Is there such a Coffee-House as Brookes's? "Brookes's" and "the Whigs" sound as if he had been at their club with me! What a fellow it is!"

The following letter is addressed to me by Mr. PRENTICE, Editor of the *TIMES*, at Manchester:

*Times Office, Manchester, April 16, 1831.*

SIR,

"I beg your attention to an article in my paper of to-day, which I send you by this post, on the state of public opinion here on the Reform Bill, which has been strangely, though I am willing to believe, unintentionally, misrepresented by Mr. Hunt.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient Servant,

"ARCHIBALD PRENTICE."

These, my friends, are a very small part of the horrible lies, and by no means the most horrible, that will be proved upon this man of your choice. But, in making use of these words, let me not be supposed to feel any anger against you. In all my numerous transactions with you I found you to be all



sincerity and truth, with the exception of Huffman the elder, who was the great crony and patron of this man. You have been deceived: you had nobody at hand to undeceive you: the lies he has told about me in your town are so monstrous as not to be thought of without shuddering. I had no means of contradiction; and if he had not had others to deal with even now, you would still have thought him a man of truth and of honour. No man is safe that exposes himself to the workings of his tongue. He might have carried on his monstrous system of falsehood for years if he had not thus come in contact with so many men placed in a situation which enabled them to expose him. He pretends that he has now a petition from you against the Reform Bill. If you have been cheated into the signing of such a document, pray rescue yourselves from the deep dishonour as soon as possible. Let the three thousand and seven hundred and thirty honest and sincere fellows who elected him, as they thought, for the public good, now sign a petition and forward it to Mr. HUME immediately, disavowing the selfish and base sentiments that have been imputed to you: this is due to your own character for sincerity and public spirit, and it is also due to that country which he has endeavoured to injure through your means. I shall, I dare say, have other proofs of his falsehood to add before this paper goes to the press; or at least in a very short time; and, in the meanwhile, I remain, with the greatest regard, your faithful friend and most obedient servant,

WM. COBBETT.

The following is a report of what took place at a meeting of the journeymen weavers of Spitalfields, in consequence of what HUNT said about them in the House of Commons:—

THE SPITALFIELDS SILK-WEAVERS AND  
MR. HUNT.

Last Saturday night a numerous

meeting of the *journeymen silk-weavers of Spitalfields* and its vicinity took place at the Camden's Head, Bethnal Green Road, for the purpose of receiving the Report of a Committee that had been previously appointed to wait on Mr. HUNT, and to request of him to present a petition to the House of Commons in favour of the measure of Reform, as introduced by his Majesty's Ministers.

Mr. RASTER was called to the Chair.

Mr. JEBB said he was one of the Committee appointed to wait on Mr. Hunt, who, after attentively reading their petition, said that, although he had received a great number of such petitions, yet not one of them so forcibly pointed out the real cause of distress with the working people as theirs did. A conversation of some length followed, when Mr. Hunt observed, that the measure of Reform, as proposed by Ministers, did not go far enough. It did not give universal suffrage and vote by ballot, and that not one of them (the Committee) would be benefited by it, or would have a vote. He continued in that strain of argument for some time, and used expressions calculated to prejudice them against the measure altogether. He then asked them, if under such circumstances, would they gladly accept it in the form proposed by Ministers? The Committee said they would, and requested his support to the prayer of their petition, which he promised them; and if he afterwards made a blunder, and used language in the House of Commons (as is reported of him), it was his own, and not theirs.

Mr. BOULTER.—I have seen, in the newspapers on the day before, a statement in which it appeared Mr. Hunt boasted in the House of Commons, that a second deputation from the *Silk-Weavers* had waited on him, and invited him to take the Chair at a General Meeting of the Operatives. I would be glad to know if the Committee know any thing of such an invitation?

Mr. JEBB.—I pledge myself the Committee does not know any thing of such

*an invitation, nor did they ever hear of the subject until they saw it in print.*

Mr. BOULTER.—Did any of the Committee utter a word against the measure of reform as recommended by Ministers, in the presence or in the hearing of Mr. HUNT?

Mr. JEBB.—*I also pledge myself they did not.*

Mr. BOULTER.—Then Mr. HUNT, as an English Senator in the British House of Commons, asserted that which was *not the fact.*

Mr. CARPENTER said, that as the enemies of reform were on the alert, and willing to suppose that Mr. Hunt would not intentionally misrepresent a fact, it might be that some persons waited on him for the purpose of playing off a *hoax*. Their Petition was so worded as to leave the people in expectation of further concessions, and he thought the weavers would not act the part of the dog in the manger.

Mr. DEANE corroborated the statement of Mr. Jebb, and added, that Mr. HUNT asked if they would like to see the elective franchise in the hands of the *little shopkeepers*, while the productive classes were excluded? One of the Committee said he did not like to see himself excluded; but thought the measure as likely to lead to beneficial results.

Mr. JOHN POYTON said that the calumny propagated by Mr. HUNT against the Spitalfields silk weavers was calculated to lead to irremediable results. In his mind, if Mr. HUNT had been employed by Sir ROBERT PEEL, or the DUKE of WELLINGTON, to injure the cause of reform, and to dash the cup of expectation from the lips of the people, he could not have discharged his duty better than he did. Did he not attempt to invalidate the thousand petitions sent in by the working classes in favour of the bill, and to describe them as nothing but hypocrites. He would ask if the boroughmongers could have a more efficient auxiliary than Mr. HUNT proved himself to be? It would not excite his wonder, although it might his contempt, to see an old hacknied

tax-eater pursuing and following such a course: but coming from HENRY HUNT, the Radical Reformer! although freedom has received a stab, yet it is no more than the sting of "the asp." He hoped the country would arouse itself in proportion to the dangers and difficulties with which it is surrounded, and by a simultaneous effort rush forward in support of Ministers, who it appears from the numbers on the division of the second reading of the bill went as far as they could in favour of the people.

Mr. JOHN DAVIS said that Mr. HUNT through life was engaged in a sea of troubled waters *hunting* after popularity, and was ready at all times to raise his voice and knock down any plan (no matter how beneficial it might turn out) that did not first originate with himself. He hoped the Spitalfields weavers would not, on the present trying occasion, desert their country, nor lend themselves to the views of any man.

Mr. JOSEPH POYTON moved that the petition be confided to the care of Mr. ALDERMAN WALTHAM.

Mr. JOHN POYTON hoped that whoever might have the care of the petition, should be requested to contradict the statements made by Mr. HUNT.

The motion of Mr. POYTON was carried unanimously; after which the meeting separated.

TO

LORD CARNARVON,

*On the Alliance between the Ministers and "TWO PENNY-TRASH."*

Kensington, April 19, 1831.

MY LORD,

IN the newspapers of the 15th of April, I read what is called a report of a speech of your Lordship, said to have been made in the House of Lords the evening before. The subject of the debate was the Reform Bill, which, as the reporter states, your Lordship re-



probated in very severe terms, representing it as revolutionary, big with confusion and anarchy; and, in short, full of all sorts of evils. In order to make good these assertions against the bill, or rather to strengthen the arguments you had made use of, you quoted a sort of inverse authority; that is, to show that the bill was bad, you asserted that those whom you deemed to be bad were amongst the supporters of the Ministers in favour of this bill. You proceeded upon the maxim of "Show me a man's company, and I will tell you what the man is." It requires a pretty good stretch, to be sure, to make this maxim apply to a case like the present; but, at any rate, such was your argument, expressed in the following words: "The noble Earl could also reckon amongst his supporters the whole of *that class from which proceeded the Twopenny-Trash, by which sedition and blasphemy were spread from one end of the empire to the other.* It was by a *confederacy* thus arrayed against the old and settled institutions of the country, that the noble Earl was cheered and encouraged in his attempts upon that system, under which the country had risen to a pitch of greatness and of happiness of which the history of other nations afforded scarcely a parallel."

Now, my Lord, men should say what they mean, by rights; and what do you mean by the whole of that class from which proceeded the "TWO-PENNY TRASH?" You either knew nothing at all about the source of "Two-penny TRASH," or you know that it proceeds solely from me. What do you mean by a class, then? I am speaking here conditionally or hypothetically, for I do not know that you ever uttered these words; but here are the words published, with your name to them as the author; and really there does want some law to punish men for putting forth publications of this sort, which may be owned or disowned at the pleasure of the author. It is, however, with the author of this publication that I have now to do, which publication I find in the *Morning Chronicle* of the

15th of April. Be the author who he may, then, he does not speak truth when he ascribes "Two-penny Trash" to a class; he does not speak truth when he says that it contains sedition and blasphemy; he does not speak truth when he charges it with being concerned in a conspiracy against the old and settled institutions of the country; he does not speak truth when he says that this nation has arrived at a pitch of greatness and of happiness; in short, he speaks not a word of truth, from the beginning of his speech to the end of it; and if a good cause is content to rely upon truth, his cause is as bad a one as ever came before the public.

*Two-penny Trash* has not been a follower of the Ministers in the cause of Reform: it has been *their leader*: they have done what it pointed out, or, at least, they have gone far towards doing it; it has never been dictated to by them in any case whatever; it would scorn to be dictated to by them. It is a fact perfectly notorious that the writings of the author of the *Two-penny Trash* have done more in the producing of this Reform, and ten times more than has been done by any other man in England, or any other hundred men. With regard to the charge of "*sedition and blasphemy*," it is the *old charge*; and it will continue to be made as long as there is any hope of blinding the people by the use of it. Another, and more important, subject, however, now presses, and I must therefore take my leave of you for the present.

WM. COBBETT.

## REAL STATE OF IRELAND.

THE following paper is the finest representation of a suffering people that ever was laid before a government. Lord ANGLESEA has recently visited the County of Clare. The people of that county took the opportunity of laying

a statement of their grievances before his Lordship. I beg my readers to go through this paper with the greatest attention, and to think seriously and mercifully of the state of these our miserable fellow-subjects.

(From the *Galway Independent*.)

April 13, 1831.

#### ADDRESS OF THE PEASANTRY.

The following is the Address of the Peasantry presented to the Marquis of Anglesea.

To his Excellency the Marquis of Anglesea, Lord Lieutenant General and General Governor of Ireland.

The humble address of the impoverished and destitute people of Clare, amounting to about the number of one hundred and fifty thousand.

With feelings of delight, gratitude, and confidence, we hail your Excellency's arrival.

Feelings of *delight* on beholding the representative of our gracious monarch, King William the Fourth, amongst us—

Of *gratitude*, for the parental solicitude thus nobly evinced by your Excellency in undertaking the arduous but humane and generous task of investigating personally the causes of disturbance in this County—

And feelings of *confidence*, in the sincerity of Your Excellency's intentions to meliorate, to the fullest extent in your power, the distresses which prevail to an alarming degree.

We humbly beg leave to state to your Excellency that the following are the real causes of disturbance:—

For a series of years, previous to the year 1800, our forefathers held several extensive tracts of land in this county, upon leases generally of one life or twenty-one years, which, according as the term expired, were renewed by the resident landlord to the tenant at a fair and reasonable rent.

That from the year 1800, a large portion of the aristocracy and gentry of this country left their ancient residences, and went to reside in a foreign country, leaving their tenantry to the management of land agents; the consequence

has been, that according as the respective farms (held as before stated) became out of lease, they were let in large farms to graziers and land-jobbers, to fatten black cattle and sheep; and we, the descendants of the old and faithful tenantry, have been cast upon the world homeless wanderers, to seek shelter for ourselves and our helpless families in huts or cabins built in bogs or commons, the residence of our forefathers being levelled to the earth by those land-jobbers.

We humbly state to your Excellency that the principal means of support our families have had for near thirty years, is the potatoe crop, and one half the year without milk: as to flesh meat, we scarcely ever can procure it more than twice a year, namely, Easter Sunday and Christmas-day.

We humbly state to your Excellency, that having but little land, and that of the most inferior kind, and numbers of us no land at all in our possession, we are obliged to pay at the rate of six to eight pounds an acre for muck or con-acre for one crop.

We humbly state to your Excellency, that the frequent inclemency of the seasons have rendered the crops so bad, that we are obliged to leave the crop on the premises in lieu of the rent, forfeiting our seed and labours, and frequently processed and decreed for the difference between what the crop thus left sells for, and our original contract, in consequence of which our families are often obliged in the summer season to pluck the rape-leaf and wild nettle-top for their sustenance.

We humbly state to your Excellency, that we have frequently, in supplicating and respectful terms, stated our grievances to the now resident gentry and landholders of the county, but up to this period they have taken no measures to relieve our distress; on the contrary, some of them have often told us, they considered all ties between them and the people for ever severed in consequence of our having exercised our undoubted and constitutional right in 1828, contrary to the will of our landlord.



We humbly state to your Excellency, that a farther cause for the miseries and distresses of this county has arisen out of the system of grand jury jobbing carried on to a shameful and unprecedented extent for thirty years; which, while it puts large sums of money into the pockets of the grand jurors themselves, and a heavy tax upon the poor cottiered tenants, affords no benefit to the labouring classes, the roads being made by the tenants of those grand jurors to pay an enormous rack-rent, which in no other shape could possibly be paid for the land.

We humbly state to your Excellency, that another great cause of the evils and miseries of this county are lay and improper tithes exacted from the industry and hard labour of the people, averaging a sum of 1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d. an acre, which in eight cases out of ten is paid to the agent of absentees to be spent in foreign countries.

We humbly state to your Excellency, a not less distressing cause of poverty, which is enormous sums of money exacted from the hard-working tiller of the land, under the title of Vestry, which the applotters and collectors pretend is for the repairs of the Church; but in truth and in fact, the four-fifths of which collection go to supply the incumbent's house with those comforts denied to us.

We humbly abstain from the introduction of the subject of tithes to the Protestant clergy, lest we should be supposed to introduce any topic which, by any possibility, could subject us to the imputation of Sectarian feeling, the great portion of your Excellency's memorialists being Catholics, leaving it entirely to your Excellency's wisdom and benignity to consider whether the members of one Church should pay, out of the hard earnings of their labour and the sweat of their brow, for the support of the richest Church establishment in the world, to the doctrines of which, in conscience, we do not, nor cannot subscribe.

We humbly state to your Excellency that another most grievous cause for the unhappy and discontented state of the county, is want of employment for

the mechanic, artisan, or labourer, although there are many thousand acres of land in this county, which, if reclaimed, would give employment, food, raiment and comfort, to the starving thousands that now humbly and supplicatingly approach your Excellency with this unhappy, but not exaggerated statement of their suffering.

We humbly state to your Excellency, that in addition to the foregoing causes of privation, the average price of labour in this county is sixpence per day, from six in the morning to six in the afternoon, without breakfast or dinner, and even that is not to be had upon an average of more than three days in the week.

We humbly state to your Excellency, that our unfortunate families average about six individuals in each family, obliged to exist upon 1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d. a week, and many weeks not able to procure that sum.

We humbly state to your Excellency, that another most grievous cause of the miseries of this county, is that Penal Law, the Sub-letting Act, an Act which, since it came into operation, has not only driven thousands from their houses in a state of destitution and sometimes starvation, but has deprived the present occupiers of the power of relieving your memorialists, some of whom would be very willing to let a portion of their land to the people but from a fear of eviction by the absentee agent, who, in almost every instance, would take advantage of the clauses in this depopulating act.

We respectfully state to your Excellency, that in our humble judgment the want of a resident Legislature has been the cause of the privations and sufferings of your memorialists, for we humbly state, that the evils complained of would not have continued to exist for thirty years without melioration from an Irish House of Parliament.

The foregoing facts are the real and true causes of discontent and disturbance in this county, and not, as unfairly and unfoundedly attributed, to want of loyalty to our gracious Monarch; in that we yield to no part of his Majesty's

dominions ; and were our stations in life as free from suffering as our allegiance is sincere, our county would never be reduced to such a state as to create the necessity of having your Excellency's kind and paternal feelings subjected to the pain of witnessing our present unfortunate condition.

We, therefore, humbly and respectfully pray, that your Excellency may be graciously pleased to lay before our gracious Monarch the facts herein set forth, fully convinced that when his gracious Majesty, through your Excellency, is informed of the real cause of our sufferings and discontent, he will, with that paternal fondness upon all occasions evinced by him towards his people of Ireland, direct the Government to adopt such measures as may relieve us, his people, from the awful but likely recurrences of famine and fever, which, alas ! have been but too familiar to the peasantry of Ireland for the last thirty years.

We humbly state to your Excellency, that there is upwards of 200,000*l.* a year absentee rents sent out of this county, one shilling of which is not spent in Ireland.

That those absentee noblemen and gentry have some hundred thousand acres of reclaimable land on their estates, upon which, if they gave encouragement and employment to the people, they would not only increase the value of their estates, but would afford subsistence and generally meliorate the condition of many thousands of your petitioners.

We humbly state to your Excellency, we are ready to work at any species of labour or employment that can save our families from starvation ; and we humbly and respectfully state that meliorating measures will have more effect in restoring peace, tranquillity, and confidence, than bayonets and insurrection acts. Death cannot have much terror for persons in the last extremity of destitution.

Signed on behalf of the members,  
 BASIL DAVOREN, Chairman,  
 CHARLES O'CONNELL, Secretary.

## DEFEAT OF MINISTERS

### *On a Division on the Reform Bill.*

"NOW WHO IS RIGHT?" In my *Register* of the 26th of March, I said, and I proved, that, *to go into a Committee* on the bill was, in fact, to give it up ; because there were many Members, who did *not* vote against it on the second reading, who, in the Committee, would vote against the vital parts of it. Thus it has happened. It was *manifest*, that the bill never could be carried *with the present House of Commons* ; and, therefore, to go into the Committee with this House, was, in reality, *to give up the bill*. Now for the *defeat* that has taken place.

On Monday, the 18th, the Ministers moved for the House to go into a Committee on this bill. The motion was met by an amendment from GENERAL GASCOYNE, Member for Liverpool, which motion was, that the number of Members for *England and Wales* should *not be diminished, but remain what it now is*. The Reform Bill lopped off fifty-eight Members for England and Wales, gave some additional Members to Ireland, and some additional Members to Scotland, and left the whole number to be six hundred. The Ministers had agreed to make an alteration in the bill in this respect. They had agreed to take five boroughs out of Schedule A and put them into Schedule B ; also, to put back seven boroughs from Schedule B into their present state of two Members each ; also to give Members to eight great English towns to which the bill had given none ; also to give an additional Member to eight English counties to which the bill had given no additional Members. This was certainly an improvement in the bill ; and it gave to England about thirty Members more than the bill had given to it. Now, GENERAL GASCOYNE's motion was, that the number of Members for England should be the same that it is now. Upon this motion, after the debates of Monday night and Tuesday night, a division took place on this amendment of GENERAL GASCOYNE, when there appeared 299 for the



amendment, and 291 against it, and thus the Ministers found themselves in a minority of eight.

It is of no consequence at all whether this motion, as a matter of detail, was right or wrong, the manifest intention of it being to try the strength of the parties. Already the Ministers had given way; they saw that this motion was the first of a series of motions to destroy the bill altogether; and they, from the first, distinctly declared that, if this motion were carried, the bill would, in effect, be lost. The conclusion of Lord JOHN RUSSELL's speech clearly shows that they regarded it as decisive as far as related to the present House of Commons. I must insert this conclusion, because it clearly shows us the state in which the Ministers now are with regard to this measure.

"The motion, worded as it was, had been designed merely to put the advocates of the bill in a dilemma, and to *retry the question of the second reading*. Ministers had thought that the vote of the House in favour of the second reading *was conclusive*, that the measure should be referred to the committee, and he (Lord J. R.) said with the noble Earl at the head of the Government, that any improvement which left the efficiency of the bill unimpaired would be adopted; but that by its efficiency the Government was ready to *stand or fall*. (Hear, hear.) When he had, last night, introduced the names of Earl Grey and of the Duke of Wellington, he had had no other object than to show, in the shortest form and in the plainest manner, that there were but *two courses—Reform or no Reform*. The Duke of Wellington had avowed himself the friend of all close boroughs, and had defended the present system and all its abuses, as the most perfect that the wit of man could devise. Earl Grey, on the contrary, had applied himself to secure the confidence of the people, by obeying the universal call for Reform. If the bill were thrown out, the consequences might be various. He would not give it out as a threat, but he might allude

"hypothetically to the results. The *Crown might, in the first place, appeal to the country*, in order to ascertain whether it approved of the decision of the House of Commons. (Much cheering.) That was, at least, *a possible case*, and it would be a very constitutional course. But suppose some modified plan of reform were introduced and adopted before the dissolution of Parliament, it must be dissolved afterwards, in order to give the people the benefit of the change. Would that be accomplished *with peace and satisfaction*, and would not the first step in the new House of Commons be for some Member, favourable to this rejected measure, to bring forward a motion to revive it? He (Lord J. Russell) could not imagine how any of the supporters of the present bill could refuse to vote for such a motion, and then, instead of peace and satisfaction, there would be a continual struggle between the people, on the one hand, to obtain effectual Reform, and the House of Commons on the other to resist it. It had been said that this bill would only be a stepping-stone to those who wished for greater changes; but he (Lord J. R.) appealed to any man whether *a more moderate bill*, which satisfied nobody, and offended many, was not much more likely to be converted into a stepping-stone. Indeed, the objection of the hon. Member for Preston was, that this reform would be final, and that when once it was made, nothing more would be granted. He (Lord J. Russell) contended, therefore, that this bill was not only much more likely to preserve the enduring excellence of the constitution of the House, while it secured the confidence of the people in its deliberations and decisions, and confirmed their affection and loyalty to the throne. The object of the bill was to raise a bar to the accomplishment of this great end; and, in conclusion, he entreated all who were friendly to the measure to vote with him and his friends."

The only question worthy of our at-

tention now, is, *Whether the Parliament will be dissolved or not?* At every step, Lord GREY has experienced the inconvenience of *not having followed my advice*. Instead of vague assurances, vague second-hand assurances, and these, too, in very general and qualified terms, of *the King's hearty approbation of the measure*, I recommended the beginning of the work by a MESSAGE from his Majesty; and if that course had been pursued, the bill, without a single alteration, would have been passed long and long enough ago. Instead of all the uncertainty, and all the turmoil; all the suspension of business; all the suspension of purchases, whether commercial or landed; all the suspension of contracts for time of every description, which have taken place throughout the whole kingdom, and which have been productive of injury to hundreds of thousands of individuals; injury admitting of no adequate description from tongue or pen; instead of an incessant and universal agitation, approaching to a dislocation of society itself; instead of three months of this sort of confusion pervading the affairs and the minds of so many millions of people, all would have been settled quietly two months ago; for had the Ministers had this message to lay before Parliament on the 3d of February, when it met, the whole matter would have been settled in the course of that month of February.

It is perfectly true, because my Lord GREY has said it, that he had the sanction of his Majesty to bring forward a bill for the reform of the Parliament. This is true; but then there wanted a more formal sanction to destroy at once the hopes of the enemies of reform. It is also true that the KING has kept these Ministers in place with this bill before the House; but the enemies of reform had no assurance that the KING would make use of all the prerogatives with which he is invested, in order to cause this bill to be carried. Now if the Ministers had proceeded by message from the KING himself, all this would have been implied in that message; and for want of the message, Lord GREY will in all pro-

bability have to experience a second chapter of 1807; that is to say, accusations on the part of his opponents of not having fully apprised his Majesty of, and obtained his acquiescence in, the measure which he has proposed to the Parliament. This is the rock on which he split, with intentions equally good, in the year 1807. His opponents, too, have this great argument, or, rather, this strong ground, which they had not at the period just mentioned, namely, that he (Lord GREY) did not at first *contemplate a measure to any thing like the present extent*. Now, then, if he have brought forward a measure much more extensive than that which he contemplated when he came into office, his opponents may, upon his own showing, contend that this, at any rate, was not the measure which he proposed to the KING as the basis of his Ministry.

But the great question with the people is, What is now to be done? It was manifest to me, and I urged it in the *Register* of the 26th of March, with all the force of which I was master, that this bill never could be carried with the present House of Commons. Many of my readers were astonished at what I said in that *Register*; for in it I expressed my doubts of the King's readiness to dissolve the Parliament; yet it was clear as daylight that the bill could not be carried *without a dissolution*. There were, out of three hundred and two who voted for the second reading, many who expressed themselves determined to oppose parts of the bill in the detail. These men voted for the second reading in order to be on the *red list*, which they knew would be published and presented throughout the country; but they also knew that they might oppose the bill in some one or other of its essential details; and thus defeat it, while their names had gone forth as its advocates. Now, there were three hundred and one who voted against the second reading; and was it not manifest that these men most firmly believed that no dissolution would take place in order to carry the bill? Therefore, in order to destroy their hopes; in order to carry the bill,



a dissolution became absolutely necessary at once, without going into a committee. My Lord JOHN RUSSELL says that the Ministers regarded the decision on the second reading as "conclusive that the measure should be referred to the committee." How they came to regard it as thus conclusive, it would puzzle the wit of man to discover. It ought to have been conclusive that the bill could never be carried with the present House of Commons, without being chipped away to next to nothing.

They now acknowledge that it cannot be carried with the present House, without such chipping away; and my Lord JOHN RUSSELL says, that the consequences must now be either a dissolution of the Parliament, or a resignation of the Ministers. The *Morning Chronicle* has, upon this subject, the following article, which appears to me to be of a demi-official character. It has been observing (20th April), that we are still in the dark as to the intentions of the Ministers; for, though the bill is ordered to be committed on Thursday night, it was generally believed, in the House, that the result of the vote must be either a dissolution or a resignation; but that the opinion that the Ministers would resign was the prevailing one. Then follows the demi-official article in these words. "The twenty-four hours following the publication of this Journal, will be the most eventful in the history of this empire, if not of the world. Ministers have been defeated in a division on the English Reform Bill, by a majority of eight, on a question which, in discussion, they deemed of vital import to the great Constitutional Reform, the basis and pedestal of their political existence as a Cabinet. The impossibility of maintaining their station by means of the present House of Commons, long predicted, is now demonstrated. It is useless to discuss the judgment or policy of patiently testing this result, by the division on General Gascoyne's Motion. Now Ministers have but two elections—*Dissolution or Resignation.* The

honesty and singlemindedness of Lord Grey leave us no doubt of his immediate adoption of *one alternative.* Be the people assured that Reform will be consequent on either course. *Revolution may yet be avoided, but the events of the next twenty-four hours will determine the crisis.*"

After this, the Editor of the *Chronicle* adds the following: "A great deal too much importance has been attached to reports of the supposed feelings of Royalty with regard to Reform. It has again been stated broadly that *the King will not dissolve Parliament*; and the declaration of Earl Grey on Monday night, that 'with respect to one threat, he had formerly disclaimed it, and had stated that he had neither the inclination nor was he armed with the authority to make use of any menace,' is cited as confirmatory of this resolution. As Ministers are determined to *stand or fall with the bill*; as Reform was made a condition of their acceptance of office; as *the plan of Reform was submitted to the King*; and as dissolution, in case the bill should be materially damaged in its progress, is the *only means* by which effect can be given to the plan, we hold it for certain that the *report of the King's unwillingness to dissolve is a base calumny.*" Oh, no! It is not a base calumny; or, at least, I do not believe it is; and so I said on the 26th of March. It is said here that "*the plan of Reform was submitted to the King.*" Why, so was the plan of Catholic Emancipation in 1807; Lord GREY distinctly stated that in the House of Commons at the time; but his opponents denied this. They allowed that a measure of emancipation was submitted to him; but they positively denied that *that* measure had been submitted to him. And Lord GREY could not call upon the KING to make a declaration upon the subject; nor can he call upon the KING to make a declaration upon the subject now. This is a thing which all due subordination to the Chief Magistrate forbids; it is a thing which decency forbids: it cannot be done

without levelling the dignity of the crown with the earth; and, in this respect, Lord GREY must be content to endure in silence the taunts which he had to endure in 1807.

This writer tells us that it is now broadly asserted, "that the King will not dissolve Parliament." Why, I gave it as my opinion that he would not, so long ago as the 26th of March. It appeared to me manifest; it appeared to me clear as daylight, that he would not dissolve the Parliament, unless strongly urged to do it by the unanimous petitions of his people; and, therefore, I urgently recommend such petitions to be immediately sent to him. On the evening of the day when that *Register* was published, several gentlemen came to me, and, in strains of great exultation, related to me the result of the grand meeting of the merchants and bankers at the Mansion-house. To their utter astonishment, I very coolly observed, that, instead of petitions to the Parliament, and an address to the KING, those merchants and bankers should have petitioned the KING to dissolve the Parliament. When they had read the *Register*, they were astonished at my doubts with regard to the readiness of the King to dissolve the Parliament, if necessary, to carry the bill: and they told me that Mr. Alderman Wood had declared, at the meeting at the Mansion-house, that the Ministers would be able to carry the bill without a dissolution of the Parliament. From that moment, I regarded the bill as lost, for the present, at any rate, and dreaded all the consequences of the severe and cruel disappointment to be experienced by the people. It was manifest to me that the KING was not disposed to dissolve the Parliament; and, while nobody who had any regard for the observance of the laws of the country could deny his perfect right to refuse to dissolve it, the only course left for the people was to pour in their prayers upon him, so to exercise his prerogative as to ensure the success of a measure which they had so much at heart.

But, again I say, the question is,

#### WHAT IS NOW TO BE DONE?

If I am to judge from the language of the *Morning Chronicle*, and from what one hears in the streets, RESIGNATION is the course that the Ministers must pursue. Indeed, it is the only course that they can pursue, unless the KING consent to a dissolution. I ascribe no fault to the KING: he is, as I said in the *Register* so often alluded to, though a KING, still but a man; and, as a man, he must have his opinions, his doubts, and his fears, as well as other men. It is clear to me, indeed, that his interest is, above that of all other men, involved in the passing of this bill; but still, it would be to make the kingly office a burden that no man could bear, to hold that he is not to exercise his judgment, and act according to that judgment. It is clear as daylight, that the reform cannot be made by this present Ministry without a new Parliament; and, therefore, for them to proceed with their Committee is only to plunge themselves deeper and deeper in inextricable difficulties. They are now beaten on a point which, according to their own avowal, they deemed of vital importance to their measure. "The basis and pedestal of their political existence as a cabinet, is, according to their own confession, knocked from under them." To attempt to cling to office after that would only be to re-act the miserable drama of 1807. Well, but *what is to happen if they resign?* The *Edinburgh Review*, in its last number, evidently anticipates this result. They anticipate that another faction will come in, whom they denominate "the HERRIESES, the PEELS, and the GOULBURNS," whom they call "miserable tricksters." It is very curious that this is precisely the appellation which these Reviewers gave to PERCEVAL and his set in 1807! The Whigs, when taunted by their opponents for endeavouring to cling to office after they had withdrawn the Catholic Bill, apologised for their conduct by saying that "it was their duty to remain to keep a set of tricksters out of power." Those tricksters got into power, however, and held it snugly for twenty-four



years, excluding the Whigs as completely as if they had been a set of foreigners. The cases are very different, I allow; for the Reform Bill has the whole nation at its back; and, if Lord GREY could but have been brought to add the BALLOT to the other parts of his plan, he might have resigned with the *certainty* of petitions to the KING from every county, city, town, and village in the kingdom, to recall Lord GREY, and dissolve the Parliament.

I think that the result would be the same now; for there is so much of real good in this bill, that all men who do not live on the abuses; all men, in all ranks of life, are eager for its adoption. Before this paper will reach the eve of my readers, the decision of Lord GREY may have been taken, and may be publicly known; but, be that decision what it may, and be the intrigues and the workings of factions what they may, *the cause of reform cannot go back*: the country feels the good of it by anticipation: it is a feast prepared; they smell it from the kitchen; and woe to them who would come and announce to them that there is to be no dinner.

The *Edinburgh Review*, the brains of whose writers always run upon the comforts of place and emolument, manifestly entertain fears, that the opposition, having beaten and turned out the Ministers, will come in themselves; and, as in the case of the Catholic Bill, bring in this very bill themselves, and call upon the Whigs to support them. The words of the Reviewer are those: "Another thing must be also reckoned upon in the prospects of these enemies of the bill. They have found by experience that the present Ministers are utterly incapable of opposing, while excluded from office, the measures they had themselves recommended while in power. So that we verily do believe the men we are speaking of, if they entertain any serious thought of power, look forward to carry the bill now in progress, if they can do no better, with the aid of the present Ministers, only changing sides in the two Houses of Parliament. Sure we are of this,

"that without some such calculation, they are worse than frantic if they attempt to break up the existing Government, wholly incapable as they are of forming any other, except by coming round to the principles of reform." This is, to be sure, pushing speculation to a great extent; but, the thing is by no means impossible. There were some passages in the speech of the Attorney-General which seemed to indicate a most horrible degree of misgiving. Soon after the beginning of his speech (the *Chronicle* observes), *great impatience* was manifested from several parts of the House. After the noise had subsided, the report makes him proceed in the following *curious* manner. *eg the reader to pay attention* to his words:

"He had a solemn and important duty to discharge, and he would not be deterred from discharging it by any manœuvring, let it proceed from what quarter it might, on an occasion such as that he was not to be cried down, or coughed down. Clamour out of doors had been spoken of, but if a *continuance of the interruption to which he was exposed were continued*, he would not hesitate to call it clamour; he would not hesitate to designate it as a measure to keep the House from coming to a vote, and getting rid of the motion for the present. Now, supposing they succeeded in getting rid of the measure in its present form, and prevented a reduction of more than twenty Members, leaving the whole number 658, they would still have left to them a variety of perplexing considerations, which might really prevent their coming to a satisfactory conclusion upon the subject during the present session, and that result, in the hands of an enemy, might be made *the means of defeating the bill*. He therefore conceived *the friends of the measure* could not adopt a course more unwise and imprudent than to give the slightest sanction to a proposition which should have the effect of embarrassing the operations of the committee. Very possibly the gallant General, the Member for Li-

"verpool, might say to them, they  
 "might split Liverpool into several  
 "districts, and give to each a repre-  
 "sentative, and so fill all the possible  
 "vacancies. That certainly might be a  
 "mode of disposing of the measure;  
 "but after what had recently occurred  
 "in Liverpool, he should have little  
 "difficulty in affirming, that no more  
 "effectual means could be adopted for  
 "defeating the measure than the adop-  
 "tion of any such proposition. (Cheers.)  
 "Yes: it would defeat the measure,  
 "and the honourable Gentleman oppo-  
 "site denied the observation, plainly  
 "avowing that he admitted its truth.  
 "He wished to know, was the hon.  
 "Gentleman a friend to the bill; did  
 "he propose the amendment in  
 "amity, and with the view of doing  
 "the bill a service? If so, he could  
 "inform him that nothing could be  
 "more calculated to do the bill an  
 "injury; in fact, nothing more calcu-  
 "lated to defeat the measure alto-  
 "gether; there was certainly no pro-  
 "position upon which the enemies of  
 "the bill would dwell with more plea-  
 "sure. It had been said that the  
 "present bill was a concession made to  
 "public clamour. He hoped he might  
 "be permitted to say that there was  
 "not in that House—not in the coun-  
 "try, one man less disposed to yield to  
 "that degrading influence than he was.  
 "He would not go one step in obedience  
 "to it; but, at the same time, he  
 "would say, that the possible imputa-  
 "tion of yielding to such an influence  
 "would not deter him from manfully  
 "avowing his determination to support  
 "to the utmost that which he thought  
 "was likely to carry into effect the  
 "long-cherished and always unchanged  
 "opinions which had governed his po-  
 "litical conduct—would not deter him  
 "from labouring to promote that which  
 "the country had received with accla-  
 "mations, and which, if rejected, they  
 "would hear of the rejection with the  
 "deepest disappointment, and which,  
 "if adopted, they would receive with  
 "rejoicings and gratitude. (Cheers.)  
 "He was putting the matter hypothet-  
 "tically, but it was an hypothesis

"which was supported by pretty stout  
 "petitions—it was an hypothesis which  
 "did not demand the clamour of 'an  
 "*infuriated multitude*' for its support,  
 "nor the aid of 'a tyrannical press' for  
 "its propagation. A noble Lord had  
 "referred to the fact, that it had gone  
 "forth to the people, and been believed  
 "by them, that the present bill would  
 "neither give them food or clothes—he  
 "believed there was no part of Eng-  
 "land, *with the exception of those dis-*  
 "*tricts* which in the month of Novem-  
 "ber were disturbed, where *such gross*  
 "*ignorance prevailed*. Suppose they  
 "were inquiring into any similar case,  
 "referring to a different body of per-  
 "sons, how would they proceed?  
 "Would they not proceed by inquiring  
 "into particular acts of delinquency;  
 "and if it were agreed that the House  
 "was not adequate to the discharge of  
 "the duties which the constitution im-  
 "posed upon it, what remained to be  
 "done but to reform it, and how were  
 "the means of reform to be devised  
 "except by inquiring into particular  
 "cases of delinquency? Much had  
 "been said of *intimidation*. (*The up-*  
 "*roar, which, during the greater part*  
 "*of the honourable and learned Gentle-*  
 "*man's speech, was kept up with little*  
 "*intermission, here rose to a height*  
 "*which rendered him quite inaudible.*)  
 "He was next understood to advert  
 "to an observation of an honourable  
 "Member opposite, that if the present  
 "Government were not in a condition  
 "to carry on the affairs of the coun-  
 "try themselves, they would at least  
 "place those affairs in such a situation  
 "as that no other Cabinet could take  
 "their places; but that was language  
 "which ought not to be held, and  
 "which certainly should not have the  
 "effect of influencing the conduct of the  
 "present Government. He conceived  
 "that the vote of the *present night*  
 "would be decisive of the question of  
 "Reform. It had been said that the  
 "Duke of Wellington and Lord Grey  
 "dictated to their respective parties.  
 "Sir R. PEEL denied that he had said  
 "that either of those noble Persons had  
 "assumed the office of Dictator. He



"merely said that they were possessed of great authority. All he meant to convey was, that they represented the two extremes, and between those there was no intermediate opinion.

"The ATTORNEY-GENERAL resumed, briefly explaining the view which he had taken of the observations of the right hon. Baronet, proceeding to observe, that hon. Members on the other side of the House *might perhaps attempt to form an Administration* without the Duke of Wellington; for after his declarations, he could not again assume office with those who, though against the present measure, were favourable to a reform of *their own devising*; and he could not help saying, that an Administration formed of them *without the noble Duke*, would be like the performance of the tragedy of *Hamlet*, the part of *Hamlet* being left out by particular desire. (*The noise and confusion again attaining a great height*)—

"Lord JOHN RUSSELL rose to claim a *patient and impartial hearing for his hon. and learned Friend*; though the hour was late, it was not so late as they had debated upon other occasions, and both he and his hon. and learned Friend would, he conceived, be *entitled to a hearing*.

"The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, in continuation, went on to say that hon. Members opposite made no proposition, lest, as they alleged, it would embarrass the Government; but surely nothing could be more calculated to create embarrassment than the course which they had taken. He had not the *slightest doubt* that, *sooner or later*—and but a little sooner or later—this measure must pass. It had been prepared in integrity, with an honest desire to remedy existing and acknowledged abuses, and it had been *dictated by necessity*—the necessity of maintaining the valued institutions of the country in their entireness and purity. He had no doubt that *this division would decide the fate of the bill*; and he, for one, should be most happy to find himself by the side of a *noble Lord* who addressed the House

"last night; and who, consistently with the tenor and opinions of his life, after the question had been put, *would be surrounded by the friends of his youth*."

The Attorney-General seems to have been shockingly flustered by the continual interruption which he experienced. He ought, for this especial occasion, to have borrowed a little brass from a Northern Member who has such abundance of it to spare, and which is proof against every thing that the wit of man can devise. We gather from this speech, however, the *despondency* of the speaker; his awful anticipations of *another ministry* being formed! This anticipation seems to have bewildered him considerably; and to have deprived him of that clearness of conception, and distinctness of expression so necessary upon such an occasion; and his embarrassment must have been greatly heightened by the kind and urgent interference of Lord JOHN RUSSELL to obtain him a patient hearing. However, observe, that he, who ought to understand the matter well, implores the friends of the bill to vote against the amendment, because the adoption of the amendment would unquestionably defeat the Bill. He states expressly that he has *no doubt that this division will decide the fate of the bill*. He again asserts, that the *present night would be decisive of the question of Reform*. He says, indeed, that he has not the *"slightest doubt"*, that, *sooner or later*, this measure must pass." This is but cold comfort, and especially for the ministry. It is manifest, indeed, from the tone, the manner, and the words, of this speech, and of the other speeches of the Ministers, that they see that they are defeated; that they fear that the King will not dissolve the Parliament; and that that parliament will not suffer them to remain in office, if one could suppose it possible that they would still cling to that office.

I have not the smallest idea that Lord GREY himself would remain in office after being defeated with regard to this measure; but, I am very far from being positive with regard to the part which some, at least, of his colleagues would

be willing to act in such a case. They have all undoubtedly given their assent to this measure; but they may not be so strictly bound to stand or fall by it as he is. He has been the great projector: it is *his* measure; and, if carried, a very moderate portion of the public applause would attach itself to them. The greater part of them have been, all their lives, decided enemies of parliamentary reform; and if they have for the moment yielded to the suggestions of his master-mind, it does not follow that they are to persevere to that extreme point which he would persevere to for the sake of carrying this measure. So that those calculations are fallacious which bind them up along with him; and it is very far from being impossible, that a considerable part of the present Ministry would not think it inconsistent to form part of another by which he might be supplanted. The speculation of the *Edinburgh Review*, that the men who supplant Lord GREY will very speedily adopt his bill, and call upon him to support it, is by no means so wild as one might at first sight imagine. To take the DUKE again, and set the whole people at defiance, is too bold a thing to be thought of; but there is a middle course, which is to take a man who is not committed at all upon the subject, to make him propose a reform, seemingly different, but coming by degrees to what will satisfy the people; and, strange as the opinion may seem, I should not be very much surprised if such a ministry were to adopt substantially all the provisions of this bill, *and the ballot into the bargain*; and then we should have the measure carried in opposition to the very man who has proposed it! And if all this were to take place, it would not be a bit more surprising than was the introduction and carrying of the Catholic Bill.

The people, therefore, need not despair. Reform has been begun; and it must be finished. No Ministry can carry on the affairs of the country, in future, without it. Every embarrassment, every suffering (and there will be enough of both), will be constantly ascribed to a want of Reform. It is not

the cry of "*demagogues*," and of "designing and evil-minded men," that have now to be answered by the boroughmongers: it is the grave and solemn charges brought against them by Lord JOHN RUSSELL, whose words we have only to repeat; whose speech will, in future, be our text-book; and, that old accusation against us, that we are not agreed as to any plan of a reform, will no longer avail our enemies; for here is the plan, and that, too, in the shape of a bill, and that bill read a second time, and thus sanctioned in principle by the Parliament itself. Under such circumstances, it will be impossible for any Ministry to carry on the affairs of the country, or even to keep it tranquil; and the country never can know peace any more until a reform to this extent be carried. For my own part, I have no predilection for *persons*: I do not care a straw by whom the thing is done, so that it be done. I should like for it to be done by Lord GREY; because, in the first place, the honour is due to him, and because the gratitude which the country will owe him would give him great strength as to ulterior measures. But, so that it be done, I care not if even PEEL or GOULBURN or even HERRIES be the instrument. I care not a straw who is minister and who not, so that the rotten boroughs be destroyed, and there be a House of Commons freely and fairly chosen by the people. There are many motives existing in the breasts of great numbers of persons by whom Lord GREY is surrounded, to induce them to wish to see power in other hands than his. It is a great vice, but it is a vice so very common as hardly to subject men to very heavy censure, to entertain a dislike to others merely because they are so vastly our superiors in those endowments which men generally covet. He who possesses this species of superiority always stands upon a dangerous eminence; is always a target for the shafts of envy and of hatred: men submit to superiority; but they submit with reluctance; and, since to raise themselves to an equality they feel to be impossible, they are gratified by every thing tending to



pull the superior down to their own level. On this eminence stands Lord GREY, at the present moment, than which there has not been one, for the last two centuries, less abundant in men of distinguished ability.

All these causes are now in powerful operation. They are tossing the nation backward and forward from one hope to another, and from one fear to another: when the turmoil will end no one can tell; but one thing is clear to every man of common sense; and that is, that there never can be real tranquillity again in this country until there be a complete change and renovation through the means of a Parliamentary Reform not less extensive than that which has now been proposed.

I conclude this article on *Wednesday*. To-morrow may bring forth something decisive with regard to the steps to be taken by the Minister: if so, I shall have to notice it in this present Register; if not, my notice of it must be deferred till my next.

WM. COBBETT.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

*Thursday morning, 21st April.*—As far as I can learn, and, indeed, I have no source of information but that of the newspapers, the *Parliament is to be dissolved forthwith*. The *Courier* of last night, and the *Morning Chronicle* of this morning, state this in the most positive terms. I need not say how glad I am that this determination has been adopted by the Ministers, and that the King has given his consent to it, especially after the ominous accounts which had been published relative to the disposition of his Majesty as to this matter. The *Courier*, which is, in reality, the Ministerial paper, which name I give it without imputation of blame to them, because some organ they must have of this literary description: this paper of the 19th instant hinted that his Majesty *disapproved of the details of the bill*; that is to say, then, of the bill itself. The *Morning Chronicle* of the next day said that it was asserted openly that the King would *not consent to dissolve the Par-*

*liament*; and, as we have seen, in the former part of this article, it said that dissolution or resignation must take place, and that it believed that the latter would be the course that Ministers would have to pursue.

It was impossible not to conclude from this that the King was hostile to the measure, and that he would not give his consent to a dissolution of the Parliament. It now appears that a cabinet council was called on the 20th, at ten o'clock in the morning; that the council remained in deliberation up to two o'clock, and that, during the sitting of the cabinet council, Lord GREY left his colleagues two or three times, and proceeded to St. James's Palace, where he had *audiences of the King*; and finally that the result was, the determination of the Ministers to dissolve the Parliament, and the assent of his Majesty to that measure.

For my part I *know* nothing of any of these facts. I do not even now know that a dissolution will take place. I believe it, however, most firmly, and that I rejoice at it I need not repeat, having constantly urged the necessity of it, ever since the division took place on the second reading. It is exceedingly to be lamented that this measure should have been delayed so long as to fill the people's minds with fear as to the disposition of his Majesty relative to this important affair. The *Morning Chronicle* of this day says: "After the vote of Tuesday night, Ministers had no longer a choice whether or not Parliament should be dissolved. We knew the course they would pursue. We knew that they would nobly redeem their pledges. We have now the satisfaction of being able to announce that a dissolution has been determined on, and we can confidently assure our readers, that an *immediate dissolution may be counted on*. We knew that the reports, so *industriously circulated*, of a *determination on the part of his Majesty not to consent to a dissolution were without foundation*; for the choice of a Ministry who accepted of office only on the condition of being authorised

“to propose reform, and the approbation of their plan of reform *necessarily implied* approbation of the constitutional means which might be requisite to give effect to it; and therefore, we could not for a moment entertain the supposition, so injurious to the reputation for sincerity and good faith of a sovereign who has always been supposed to possess these virtues in a very eminent degree, that he would allow his servants to feed the country with hopes of a reform which he was yet determined should not be obtained with his good will.”

What! blame people for industriously circulating reports which you yourself led the way in circulating! You first excite the doubts and fears, and then say that you could not for a moment entertain the supposition of their having any ground to rest on: first, fill the whole town, aye and the whole country, too, with alarm upon the subject; first say, that dissolution or resignation must be the course of the Ministers, and give your opinion in favour of resignation; and then affect to blame people for circulating a report of the King's determination not to dissolve. You will write till there is not another pen full of ink left in the world, before you will persuade the people to believe, *that you did not believe, only yesterday morning*, that the King would not give his consent to the dissolution. I am very loath to impute blame in any degree to the author of so much good as is contained in this Reform Bill; and I am not presumptuous enough to pretend that there might not be motives quite sufficient to induce Lord GREY to postpone the bringing of the matter to this issue; but, according to that which appears on the surface of things, I cannot help believing that his Majesty might have been spared the risk of exciting suspicions and alarms in the breasts of the people. Yesterday morning, it was notoriously a question of dissolution or resignation. This was the tone of all the papers friendly to the measure. It was manifestly a question, at the least; and to make it a

question at all, was to place the King in a situation in which he never ought to have been placed. The mail coaches of last night carried the doubts and the alarm all over the kingdom. It is not necessary to say what feelings those doubts must have inspired. It is not necessary to say this; but we may confidently say, because it is written by the pen of nature herself, that such feelings, when once awakened, *never leave the breast in the state in which it was before*. It was, above all things, to be desired, that not the smallest doubt should be excited in the minds of the people with regard to his Majesty's conduct and disposition in this affair. It was to be desired, for the sake of those “institutions of the country,” of which so much has been said, that the boroughholders should yield with a good grace, and conciliate the people by so yielding; but, can there be a friend to the institutions of the country, and to the great institution of all, who does not lament the exhibition of a Cabinet Council, the chief of which is going backward and forward to the King upon the subject of his consent to a measure so absolutely necessary to the success of this bill? Can there be a real friend of a Government in King, Lords, and Commons; can there be a man in the whole country, who does not entertain a wish to see the whole of this ancient fabric overthrown, who does not lament that things were brought to this pass; and especially when it might have been so easily avoided? Does any man believe, that the stories about the proceedings at Windsor will not have done harm prodigious? However, let us hope that the thing is settled now; and let us hope also, that the aristocracy who are opposed to the bill, will, at last, give way with as good a grace as they can. If their minds admitted of just impressions upon this subject, those impressions would be made by the speech made by Mr. HAWKINS in the House of Commons the night before last, a speech which, according to my judgment, was the finest that I ever read in my life, and which, if I have not room for it now, I should think it



my duty to insert in my papers as soon as possible, not only in justice to the speaker, but as a pattern for the imitation of every young man in England who shall have occasion to address a public body on political matters. I suppose that the dissolution will now take place very speedily. The people stand in need of no advice as to what their conduct ought to be with regard to that dissolution. Their conduct has been so admirable, in every part of the country; they, and particularly the working classes, whom the bill excludes from the direct exercise of the right of suffrage, has been marked by prudence, by moderation, by disinterestedness, by magnanimity, by public spirit, such as the world never before beheld, except, perhaps, in the outset of the American Revolution; and, even in that case, the devotion to country did not surpass that which we have now beheld.

This conduct, on the part of the millions in Scotland, in Ireland, as well as in England, give the lie, and that, too, in the most pointed manner, to all those who have treated them as "peasantry" and as "rabble." They are not to have precisely what they had frequently prayed for; an abstract, but still a clear right is to be withheld from them: but do they complain; do they repine; do they clamour for any thing more than that which the Ministers have tendered them? On the contrary, all eagerly rush forward, out-voters, populous towns which were to have no Members, scores of thousands assembled together, who were to have no direct representatives; all hasten forward voluntarily to declare that here is so much of good, that they are contented and grateful. All seem ready to make sacrifices; all seem ready to say, and they do say, Think not of us: here is the safety and salvation of our country, to secure which we are ready to sacrifice every personal consideration. Great and glorious was the conduct of the people of England in the case of the unfortunate Queen Caroline; but this is a matter of a still higher order; here the sound understanding,

as well as the feeling of generosity, are brought into full play; and all that was wanted to make the scene which England now presents to the world the grandest that that world ever witnessed, is, disinterestedness and public spirit on the part of the aristocracy, equal to that which is so amply displayed by the working people.

And is this the people of whose encroachments, and of whose sinister designs and latent intentions that aristocracy are afraid? Such forbearance never was practised by any common people upon the face of the earth. There can be no doubt in the mind of any rational man that it was the formidable attitude of the people, their resolution to recover their rights, that emboldened the Minister to propose this salutary measure. He has the honour, and always will have the honour, of being the author of the measure; but every man knows, and no man better than himself, that he would not have dared even to propose this measure, if he had not had the people heartily at his back. They know this as well as he; and yet, with what admirable forbearance they have exercised their mighty power! Represented by *one man*, as disaffected to the measure, as craving for more, as discontented and as being envious of the middle class, to whom the right of voting is given; thus represented, they have hastened, from all parts of the kingdom, to disclaim the foul imputation. In short, conduct so truly admirable never was before witnessed on the part of any people, conduct so clearly proving that they have always been sincere in their prayers and professions, and that their superiors in rank and wealth may safely confide in their justice and moderation. And, what is the return that they have met with? I do not answer for the truth of the following paragraph, taken from the *Morning Chronicle* of to-day, describing the conduct of the enemies of Reform in consequence of the supposed decided victory, in the House of Commons, on Tuesday night: "The anti-reformers were extremely lavish of their money yesterday. The Duke of Northumberland gave five

"guineas to the bell-ringers of St. Martin's, to ring a peal, in consequence of the majority. The *High Church Parsons*, in several parishes, *testifying their joy in like manner.*" I do not know that this is true; but if it be true, what a return is this for the generous conduct of the people! Let us hope, however, that after all, the aristocracy will so act as to regain the good-will of this good-natured and forgiving people; and that England will now exhibit to the world an example of patriotism worthy of our forefathers in their best days.

I cannot conclude without observing to my readers, that, after all, I must see the dissolution *officially announced* before I shall feel entirely satisfied on the subject. There is a *tardiness* in the announcement which I do not like; and though we are always prone to listen to our wishes, I cannot say that I am even yet entirely divested of my fears upon this point. There has been such an obstinacy on the part of the foes of reform; they have been so persevering; they have so constantly shown that they had a firm reliance upon something; that until I see the dissolution *officially announced*, I shall have my doubts upon the subject. I have no doubt at all of the final triumph of the cause of reform; I know that that cause cannot go back one inch; but I am anxious to see the cause triumph by those peaceable means; those means so well-known to the laws of the country; I am so anxious that it should succeed without giving a shock to the form and frame of the Government which has so long existed, and under which the country has been so great and so happy; and I am so firmly convinced that this peaceable settlement cannot take place without a dissolution of this present Parliament, that, in spite of my wishes, I cannot help listening to my fears. However, a few hours will determine the question, though, perhaps, not before this paper will go to the press.

FRIDAY MORNING.—The dissolution will take place in three or four days. A great body of the people of West-

minster have, with praiseworthy promptitude, petitioned the King to *dissolve the Parliament*. Every other body of the people should follow the example, if there be time before the dissolution be *officially announced*. When the dissolution shall have been *officially announced*, addresses of THANKS should pour in upon the King, from all parts of the country, and that, too, as speedily as possible. It is our duty to support him, and to prove our heart-felt gratitude to him, on this occasion.

### CURIOUS.

A SCENE which took place in the House of Commons on Wednesday night last, is well worthy of attention. Mr. LENNARD, in presenting a petition from the non-resident freemen of the Borough of Maldon, expressing themselves ready to sacrifice their private interests for the sake of the public good, said, that,

He would offer that Petition to the Member for Preston as one among many proofs that he had mistaken the feeling of the people of this country. He (Mr. Lennard) was satisfied that many, not only of those who derived no immediate and personal advantage from the bill, but that many of those who would be subjected by it to personal sacrifices, were, nevertheless, on public grounds, most anxious to give it their support.

Mr. HUNT said that the people were undoubtedly in favour of the bill, so far as disfranchisement of the rotten boroughs went; but he was also sure that they supported it because they expected to get some relief in consequence of the measure.

Mr. HUME observed, that all persons who gave up private privileges for the attainment of a great public object deserved praise for their conduct. Such had been the course pursued by the hon. Member for Chichester and by Sir Sandford Graham, and in both instances from the purest motives. The hon. Member for Preston did not do justice to the sentiments of the people, and he (Mr. Hume) had the authority of Mr. Doherty, of Manchester, for declaring that the hon. Member's representations of the opinions of the people of that town were most erroneous.

Mr. HUNT said, that amongst other contradictions that had been offered to his assertions, the hon. Member for Staffordshire had said that he should be able to lay before the House a petition from Dalsten, denying that the reformers of that place entertained the opinions which Mr. Hunt had attributed to them on



the subject of Reform. He (Mr. H.) knew the efforts that had been made to obtain the signatures to that petition, *and he knew also that for five shillings he could obtain any number of signatures he might require to any petition.* (Cheers.) He repeated his assertion, that the country was not favourable to the bill. Ministers had not shown that any good would be effected for the purpose by that measure, nor had they, on their parts, evinced a wish to reduce the burdens of the people. They had even gone so far as to tell the country that no reductions of taxation could be effected! (Hear.)

Mr. HUME was only desirous to defend those whom the hon. Member for Preston had misrepresented, and had no wish to attack that Gentleman. He and those who agreed with him were willing to take by the bill all the good they could obtain, and at the same time that they by no means accused the hon. Member for Preston. They regretted that he acted as a drag upon those who support the Ministerial measure of Reform. (Hear.)

Mr. LYTTLETON presented a petition from West Bromwich and other places in the county of Stafford in favour of the ministerial plan of Parliamentary Reform, and he moved that the petition be read at length by the Clerk at the Table; which having been agreed to, it then appeared that the petition referred to an opinion which had gone abroad that the *working classes were unfavourable to the measure of Reform.* The petitioners *denied that statement altogether*, and, for their own parts, earnestly prayed the House that the bill might pass into a law.

Mr. HUNT said, that he spoke of the opinions of the working classes of Staffordshire, *from what he conceived to be good information.*

Mr. LYTTLETON did not deny that the petition had been forwarded with the view of *counteracting the statement* made by the hon. Member for Preston; that certainly was the impression upon his mind.

The SPEAKER was sure the hon. Member must now feel satisfied, that a petition calculated to produce such an impression ought not to have been presented.

Sir. C. WETHERELL contended, that a petition presented for the purpose of denying any statement made by any hon. Member in his place in parliament ought not to have been received, and he should therefore move that it be withdrawn.

Mr. RICE observed, that the petition only stated that the petitioners had heard that declarations had been made. This was no direct allusion to what had taken place in that House; and he was sure that the House would not force an inference against the petitioners, merely because after the petition had been received, the hon. Member who had presented it had stated that he believed it referred to what had taken place in that House. Similar declarations had been made out of that House, and it might be to those declarations that the petition referred.

The SPEAKER said he had not interfered till he heard the hon. Member who presented the petition state that his impression was, that it referred to what had taken place in that House. If the impression of the House coincided with that, *they could not receive it without violating their own rules.*

Mr. HUNT said, that the petition had been *got up fraudulently in London and sent down to Staffordshire.*

Mr. LYTTLETON was satisfied that there was nothing of fraud about the petition, and that there was *never a more groundless assertion than that made by the hon. Member for Preston.* After a few words from Sir Charles Wetherell and Mr. C. Forbes, the petition was ordered to be printed.

It is curious to see the Speaker so anxious to prevent this petition from being received. The House did, however, receive it, and cause it to be printed. Sir CHARLES WETHERELL, curious indeed, is against the petition being received. Colonel SIBTHORP, too, in the course of the debate, cordially agreed with the Member for Preston, that the Bill "*was not acceptable to the people of England.*" He said he believed it to "*be a fraud upon the country*, and "*the more it was exposed, the more the people would be disgusted with it.*" How curious is this agreement of opinion between the great radical reformer and the man who is for no reform at all!

## MR. HAWKINS'S SPEECH,

*In the House of Commons, April 19th, 1831.*

Mr. HAWKINS rose and spoke as follows:—As I consider the present motion of the gallant General as the first of a series of somewhat similar measures, whose tendency, whether intentional or not, will be to defeat what may be called the disfranchisement part of the present bill; and as to all such attempts I am prepared to give the most strenuous opposition in my power, I shall, perhaps, be sparing the time of the House if I take this opportunity of stating, once for all, my opinions on this part of the subject, and, as briefly as possible, a few of the reasons which have induced me to consider the Schedules A and B as the most important and most indispensable part of the present measure. (Hear.) I would, most assuredly, Sir, not have troubled the House now, had I succeeded in catching your eye on either of the former debates, and even now, were my own interests alone affected by the vote which I am about to give, I should have preferred giving that vote in silence;

nor would I have obtruded upon the attention of the House any reasons for the correctness of those opinions, for the sincerity of which such a vote would have been a sufficient guarantee. But, Sir, the House will probably think with me, that the sacrifice, even to a great constitutional necessity, of the privileges of those who have entrusted their interests to my keeping, demands a few words in justification of so painful a duty; and the more especially so, as, in the present instance, this sacrifice of them is not rendered less painful to me by any corruption on their part. If I had paid, or was about to pay, directly or indirectly, by myself or by others, a single farthing for the seat I now hold, I might have been expected to reconcile myself without regret to this vote, upon the incontrovertible plea that purchase makes property, and that I had a right to do what I like with my own. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) But, Sir, as I have no such excuse to offer to my constituents, the smallness of whose numbers is their only fault, I am unable to avail myself of such an application of a new constitutional doctrine either in excusing myself to them, or in arguing to the House; yet, though I have no such exquisite reason, yet I think I have reasons good enough, and some few of them I shall, with permission of the House, proceed to offer. Of course, Sir, I shall avoid, as strictly as possible, all arguments for the mere purpose of proving that of which I am glad to see so many have become convinced since the first introduction of this measure, of which this House seems, at last, as unanimously convinced as the people—the necessity of some reform; but one argument there is which I shall notice, inasmuch as the unfairness of its sophistry is only equalled by the constancy of its repetition. I allude to that class of antagonists who do not venture into the brunt of the battle with a decided opposition to reform, but who always entertain a sincere conviction, at any given moment, that the present is not the right moment for the discussion of this question (hear, hear, hear), and they arrive at such conviction by this ingenious dilemma—when the people are clamorous for reform, they tell us that we ought not to concede such a measure to the demands of popular turbulence; and when the people are silent, that silence is a proof of indifference, and therefore the measure need not be passed. (Hear, hear, hear.) I will readily allow, Sir, to those tacticians all the merit which is due for a very skilful disposition of such forces as they possess; but it is scarcely necessary to remind them, by way of serious answer, that if the turbulence of yesterday was their only reason for refusing reform, the tranquillity of to-day is a conclusive reason for granting it. (Cheers.) If, as they themselves say, we sit here to consult the interests rather than the wishes of the people, surely, Sir, their patience under misgovernment is no more an excuse for our denial of their rights, than

would be their impatience under salutary control a reason for surrendering our own. (Cheers.) And this allusion to the wishes of the people reminds me of one other argument of our adversaries, concerning the way in which this measure has been received by the people of England, which I will notice on account of its originality; and at this stage of the debate we should be unreasonable indeed, if we were not thankful for originality of argument in any shape. (Hear, hear.) If one of his Majesty's Ministers had told us, as a proof of the merits of this measure, that its appearance had been hailed by reformers of all parties, and all opinions, as the signal for rallying again round that constitution whose regeneration they had abandoned in despair; if his Majesty's Ministers had told us how this measure had reconciled to the Legislative Authority of this House the friends whom its corruption had disgusted, and the enemies whom its misconduct had exasperated, we should have found in the Petitions laid on this table since the appearance of the bill the natural and satisfactory grounds on which such assertions were founded. But whoever expected to hear this fact seriously brought forward, as it has been, as a reason against this bill?—"Your measure must be bad, because it is approved by every body."

"Your sins are great, because they are so small."  
(Hear.)

Sir, I have heard much in my childhood of a precept to this effect—that he who begins by attempting to please every-body, will probably end by pleasing nobody; but this is the first time I have heard either a person or a measure abused upon the express ground that it actually did please every-body. Surely, Sir, the dearth of argument on that side of the House has induced hon. Members, in the desperation of this last struggle for political existence, to snatch up hastily their adversaries' weapons at the risk of cutting their own fingers. Sir, I acknowledge this change of tone in the Petitions of the people; and I hail it as a gratifying proof (to those by whom such proof is needed) that the people are not unreasonable; that they will give up as much to the prudence of their rulers, as they expect to obtain from their generosity; and will prove by the example of the present, to those who will not condescend to read the history of the past, how very limited a measure of confidence on the part of a Government in the fidelity of its subjects is repaid—with how full a confidence on the part of those subjects in the wisdom and integrity of their rulers. (Hear, hear.) And now, Sir, that I may keep my promise of brevity better than such vows are usually kept, I will omit what I would have said on those inquiries into the primitive form of our representative system, of which we have in former years heard so much; and I will more willingly give up those doctrines of abstract right, so much insisted on by our predecessors in this great cause. I should even be content,



for the purposes of this dispute, to assume that our right to our present liberties is a prescriptive right alone; for, by the very same evidence whereby this is proved, I claim the same prescriptive right to occasional necessary reform. If I am referred to the records of history for the title deeds of our representative system, that same history tells me of alterations in that system, compared with which the present measure dwindles into insignificance. (Hear, hear.) If I am told that the transfer of the elective franchise from Gatton to Birmingham, without judicial procedure, is a violent innovation, I cannot but recollect that within little more than a century, two independent legislatures have been blotted out from the page of the constitution, (hear, hear,) and with them the greater part of the representation whereof they were composed. If I am told that the vested rights of the present constituency are inviolable, I ask (and though so frequently asked before, it has never yet received an attempt at an answer) what has become of the 40s. freeholders of Ireland? (Hear.) Sir, that very revolution of 1688, which has sometimes been appealed to as the definitive resting-place of our constitutional ark, as the Sion of our political wandering, that revolution which changed the succession to the throne, is surely sufficient precedent for the disfranchisement of a nomination borough. (Hear, hear.) Sir, if the success of my own argument were the sole interest I felt in this question, I should willingly risk the event of the controversy on this appeal to historical precedent; but I will not place the cause of the people of England on any such narrow ground of defence. We seek not this reform as a matter of abstract right, but of practical expediency; we claim it, not as the fruit of historical research, but of historical experience; (hear, hear;) we ask it, not because it was so in our forefather's time, but because it would have been so now, had our forefathers lived in ours. (Cheers.) Sir, it is not enough to tell us that our borough system is now what it was 200 years ago. It is not enough to tell us that a system of tyrannical compulsion and corrupt influence which was in harmony with the violence and fraud of the political warfare of those days, which was in harmony with the remains of feudal power and the remembrance of feudal fidelity, which was suited alike to the selfishness of their political vices and the sternness of their political virtues; it is not enough to tell us that such a system is not grown worse, or even that it is considerably improved. If the political struggles of those days were, compared with the polite encounters of our own, the warfare of giants, they displayed the selfishness and tyranny of giant natures; and when the bludgeon was the umpire of popular meetings and the axe of legislative assemblies, it was natural and unavoidable that corruption and intimidation should be reckoned the two main pillars of established Government and social order, and that politi-

cal honesty should be identified with blind fidelity to the landlord or the party leader. But now, Sir, that the Sunday Pamphlet has superseded the bludgeon of the mob; now, that the daily journal has been admitted, by mutual consent, as a fitter arbiter between contending factions than the axe; now, that the prim schoolmaster is found a more effective bugbear to political disturbers than the grim headsman, it is too much to demand of us the continuance of those means of Government whose worst corruption was unnoticed amidst the greater hideousness of the ends to which they were rendered subservient. (Hear.) Sir, I never contemplate the discussions which have passed on this question, but I feel myself half a convert to the now unfashionable conduct of the wisdom of our ancestors. I am told that they had, of necessity, less experience, and less wisdom than ourselves. Less experience I admit they had; but that they had less wisdom I almost doubt, when I see that, unlike their descendants, they made, to the best of their ability, a practical application of that experience to the necessities and difficulties which occurred; and were Sir Thomas More really to rise from his grave for the purpose of instructing a Poet Laureate in political economy, he might well ask us what do we gain by our superior knowledge and accumulated experience, when a few sounding phrases and a few hard names are sufficient to deter us from putting to a practical use the results of that experience, and the deductions of that knowledge. (Hear, hear.) So much, Sir, for the authority of past generations; now a few observations addressed to the reflection and the experience of the present. Of course, Sir, I shall not be called upon at this day, either in or out of this House, to answer an opponent who seriously pretends ignorance of the measure in which our nomination system works, whatever may be his opinion of the results which it produces. Upon the former of these questions, there is no longer either mystery or disagreement; to the latter I shall briefly address myself. Now, Sir, this question of the results of our borough system is a question of fact; and it is a question of fact which the limits of debate preclude us from adducing as satisfactory and direct testimony; for such testimony would be nothing less than the political history of England for such a period as the disputants should agree in considering a fair criterion. To enter satisfactorily upon such a field of inquiry is, in this place, manifestly impossible; and to touch upon it by quoting a few isolated examples is only opening a vast magazine whence disputants on either side may furnish themselves with a species of light weapon of equal brightness, but equally indecisive. We have been told, for instance, of the talent habitually introduced into the House through the narrow portal of a close borough; but we have not been told what proportion this talent bore to the aggregate mediocrity, not to say occasional imbecility, of such introductions.

Honourable Members opposite string up their dozen of choice pippins in a golden row to win our admiration; but we have not been called to notice the bushels of crabs which have sprung from the same stock. (Cheers.) And surely, Sir, it would not have weakened our opponent's case, if they had bestowed some pains in showing that this talent had been generally applied to the service of the country, and not of its possessors and their patrons. Napoleon's servile Senate was a collection of the talent, the science, and the experience of France; but we shall hardly refer to that as a pattern of a legislative assembly. (Hear, hear, hear.) And these observations, Sir, remind me of what is, after all, the fatal objection to such a system of election; that which is, to my mind, the decisive reason against the existence of even the purest of these boroughs. We have heard much boasting of the independence of our self-elected legislators; and if independence is always to be measured by irresponsibility, it is not to be denied that they are most aristocratically independent of that people whose representatives they are so fond of styling themselves. But here, Sir, is the fatal taint in the source from whence they spring, here is that illegitimacy of origin which will ever stand in the way of that salutary respect which all rulers, to make their rule effective, should enjoy in the eyes of the people. Legislators they may be, wise and honest legislators if you please, but representatives they are not and cannot be. Hereditary members of an elective assembly, peers in the House of Commons, by their presence here they intercept from the hereditary branch of the legislature that popular confidence which they cannot enjoy themselves. (Cheers.) Sir, there is no one remark which our adversaries are more assiduous in submitting to our attention than the necessity, that a legislative assembly should so far enjoy the confidence of the people that it should not be obliged to act as the mere momentary index of popular will; that it should represent the opinions of the community upon an average of years, and be responsible for the ultimate tendency rather than the particular line of its conduct. Sir, in this doctrine I most cordially agree: and I do, therefore, protest against the continuance of that system of representation which compels the people to interfere with a jealous expression of their opinions on each particular action of this House that does not fall in with their momentary humour; because they feel, that whether the ultimate results of that action be such as to justify us or not, they at least will have no future opportunity of controlling the actors, or of adopting precautions against the repetition or continuance of the action. It is, Sir, for these reasons that the press admonishes us by threats instead of advice (hear, hear); that the manufacturing artizan enrols his name in affiliated societies, instead of subscribing it to

Petitions (hear, hear); that the agriculturist winks at, if he does not encourage, the outrages of his labourers, as a circuitous means of lightening those taxes which had disabled him from meeting their demands; it is, Sir, for these reasons that (however our adversaries may persist with a politic affectation of fear to transpose the terms) that Revolution has been called for when reform was wanted; it is, Sir, to the obstinate continuance of this antiquated corruption that we owe those periodical outbreaks of popular discontent which, since the first French Revolution, have kept that people, and among them the greatest intellect of the age, in a state of wonder at the continued existence of a Constitution which only throws off its peccant humours by this system of chronic convulsions. (Hear.) It is, Sir, to use the language of common life—it is because I am obliged to secure, not by force, at least by an understood readiness to apply it, the good conduct towards me of that man to whom I can offer no other motives; it is because a very little knowledge of human nature would make the most careless disposition unwilling to trust for a moment out of sight that man who has any power in his possession, but of whose character I do not approve, and over whose actions I have no control. (Hear, hear.) But, Sir, as I said before, it is quite impossible to prove general misconduct, or general merit, by any number of particular instances which the limits of debate will permit us to quote; there is but one indisputable criterion to which we can appeal in this place; and that criterion must be sought by each individual among the results of his own observation, and his own experience without these walls. That criterion of legislative capacity is the general effect produced upon public opinion by the conduct of such a legislation; a slow, silent, continuous effect—visible, indeed, through the whole of its insidious progress to those whose business it is to watch the signs of the times—the gathering thunder-cloud of a summer's day—unbeeded by less attentive observers, until the first audible mutterings of its wrath, and unnoticed by the multitude in general, until it burst in storm and desolation on the land. This is that unerring criterion to which rulers have never yet appealed until the eleventh hour; this is that indisputable sign of the times which Governments never deign to notice until they can no longer close their eyes to the lightning nor their ears to the thunder. (Cheers.) There is, indeed, Sir, on this question of fact—on this question of the good or bad results of our present system—one argument which I shall suggest to the House—an application of the old argument from cause to effect. What, Sir, is the plain state of the case now before this court? Here are two parties: one affirming the good effects of our nomination system; the other, at least equally numerous, and if not more disinterested, at least placed in circumstances which throw less suspicion over their testimony, af-



firming, with as bold an appeal to experience, the bad effects of the same system! So far, Sir, the testimony in favour of us is at least of equal value with that in favour of our adversaries; but what will be said when these very adversaries join most cordially with us in their character of the system which produces these much-disputed effects? Why, Sir, these very trumpeters of this House—those champions of our motley franchise—allow that they are astonished when they contemplate the apparently inadequate causes which produce these vaunted results; they allow that they cannot explain by what miracle of our politico-moral nature such purity is engendered of such corruption. (Hear, hear, hear.) We infer the existence of bad effects from bad causes. Our adversaries join with us in our character of the causes, but infer therefrom nothing but good effects. (Hear.) Thus much, Sir, for those who, abandoning the machinery of our representative system as untenable ground, take up their position in defence of its results. But there is another, and no less numerous class, who, giving up both machinery and results as equally indefensible—who, acknowledging that they see here no exception to the old rule of "Like causes produce like effects," demur, nevertheless, to any proposal for amending the system from an apprehension of danger, whose magnitude, in their eyes, is perhaps to be explained upon the old principle of "*omne ignotum pro mirifico*;" inasmuch as they have never yet been able exactly to specify what that danger is. The sole difference between them and us is, Shall the decayed parts of the system be mended or not? Both are agreed how much the system wants mending, but one party is unwilling to begin so perilous a job. Both are agreed that it is in rags and tatters; but whenever we begin to thread the darning-needle, they exclaim, "Leave it alone, in the name of prudence—in the name of caution—in the name of Robespierre and Danton—it is so rotten, that if you attempt to put a stitch in the whole will fall to pieces." I will not stop, Sir, to remind such objectors what manner of compliment they are paying to the old garment which has served their turn so long, and for which they profess such a veneration (a laugh); but do they not see the inevitable inference which the political renovators would draw from this admission? Would not the answer be ready and irreplicable? If the state of the garment be such as you avow, then it is high time to get a new one. And is not this, Sir, the dilemma in which the obstinate refusal of all the moderate and timely amendments has, for some time, placed us? Have we not been told by a loud, if not a strong party, that the Legislature of England is incorrigible? that it is too rotten to be patched up, and that it is high time to get a new one? And to whom do we owe this, but to those who passed by every opportunity for a timely reform, with an impudent denial of the existence of any blemish

(cheers); and who now, when such denial is no longer possible, think to evade the results of their own obstinacy by an affectation of sudden discovery, that such blemishes have gone too far—have spread themselves too universally through the system, to leave any part where a repair may be commenced without danger of pulling the whole to pieces? (Hear, hear, hear.) And these, Sir, are the self-elected champions of our Monarchical Government? And these are the best grounds on which they would risk its defence? Sir, I am not of their opinion. I have better thoughts of that monarchy of England, which has withstood far more serious renovation than this; I have better thoughts of those institutions which our ancestors feared not to reform and repair whenever they saw need so to do. I tremble not at their exposure to the ordeal of public opinion; through that ordeal they were never yet passed but they came out with equal beauty and with renovated purity (hear, hear, hear); from those struggles which have exuded the superfluous flesh the bone derives its strength and the sinews their elasticity. What these apprehensions of danger are it is in vain for us to ask. Our opponents have on this subject contented themselves with vague generalities, nor have they even condescended to place before us any intelligible picture of those phantoms which exercise so powerful an influence over their own imaginations. We cannot, of course, be expected to combat those forces which will not take the field. We can only ask, what danger there will henceforth exist which does not exist now? What supports the monarchy and peerage now but public opinion? and how can that support be weakened when we have enlisted public opinion in their favour by granting that reform which, of all others, public opinion is now most loudly demanding? (Loud cheering.) We have been told, indeed, that the House of Peers could not exist without the support which it derives from its nominees in this assembly. But, Sir, were we to grant this we should immediately ask, what supports this assembly? If the House of Peers is thrown back upon the House of Commons, on what does the House of Commons rely? After all the discussions of the theoretical, and the intrigues of the practical statesman, we come ultimately and in the last resort to public opinion as the tortoise which is to carry the elephant, which carries the ministerial world; and, however we may consult our distaste for unpalatable remedies, however we may think to avoid the bitter necessity of physic by attributing our strength to the disease of which we are dying; however we may flatter our imagined dignity by a vaunted independence of popular opinion; it is that popular opinion which is our best staff of support, though we will continue to insult it by clinging to a broken reed. (Cheers.) This topic, Sir, reminds me of Mr. Canning, and which is thus briefly

summed up in his own words:—"If you reform the House of Commons on the ground of past misconduct, what will you do with the House of Lords?" Now, Sir, this objection to reform in general, is shortly and conclusively answered by a reference to that part of the bill which is now the subject of discussion. In the schedules A and B is written that which we intend to do with the House of Lords: we intend to deprive them of that corrupt and unconstitutional influence which they exercise in this House; intend to confine them to their own court; we wish in future that either House should be what it was intended to be, a court of perpetual appeal from the decisions of the other, instead of that monstrous anomaly which they now offer to the world of two courts, designed to control each other, but ruled in a great measure by the same judges, and controlled by a mutual influence. (Cheers.) One complaint has been made against the particular part of the measure now under discussion, which comes with a peculiarly bad grace from those by whom it is now put forth; we are told of the anomalies both as regards population and property, which will still defend our representative system, as if those anomalies could be put for one instant in comparison with those which now exist, and as if those very persons would not be the most vociferous in scouting such a reform as would be necessary to sweep away all anomalies whatever. (Cheers.) Another complaint I will notice is one not directed against the measure itself, but against those who have introduced it; and this complaint I approach with some diffidence of my own Constitutional knowledge. Sir, I must confess (and I shall be thankful for correction if wrong), I must confess that I was not aware until the late debates on this question, that the appeal of a British King from his Parliament to his people was an unconstitutional measure. I had thought that both the theory and practice of our Constitution had decided, that a Parliament at issue with its constituents on a great Constitutional question might, by no unprecedented exercise of the Royal Prerogative, be sent back to those constituents, if not for further instruction, at least for further proofs of confidence. (Cheers.) And now, Sir, before I sit down, one word concerning that people of England, to whose hopes and wishes, as it seems, his Majesty's Ministers must not even allude in this House, without danger of being taunted from the opposite bench, with an appeal to their physical force! I, Sir, shall put forth myself no vaunting defiance of that giant power which now sleeps a faithful servant at our feet—that power which never yet put forth its strength but in our defence, and against which, if once it turn in madness on its master, no defiance will avail. (Cheers.) If, as a legislator, I am called upon to forget that the people have hands, as an Englishman I cannot forget that they have hearts; and at all times, indeed, but more especially in times like these, I do

think those hearts worth the winning, even at the price of my own power. (Loud cheering.) We have been accused of attempting by a threat of revolution to intimidate those very opponents, whose favourite argument against this bill—whose staff of reliance, if I may judge from their cheers, is their own fear of revolution as the ultimate consequence. Why, Sir—threat for threat—upon our joint showing of the case, the question would only be which way led soonest and straightest to revolution. They do not defend acknowledged iniquities of the present system upon any other grounds than those of general expediency; they acknowledge the occasional personal, and constant moral, corruption inflicted by our present nomination system; but it is the only way, forsooth, of keeping things quiet; the only way of saving the monarchy, the peerage, and the church. Why, Sir, may we not entertain the same fears as our adversaries? Why are they to be allowed to allege their own prospective cowardice as a reason against that measure, in favour of which we must not state our present apprehensions? (Hear, hear.) Sir, I am not afraid of a revolution in either case. I am not afraid of that physical violence, against which, if we were not protected by the good sense of the people of England, the bigotry of their self-elected rulers would be but as a broken reed. But I do think that we shall give no small confirmation of that charge of legislative incapacity which is now ringing in our ears, if we neglect to repair our house while it is still summer, because the winter hurricane is not yet upon the horizon. (Hear, hear.) It is because we can retreat with dignity that I wish to retreat now; I wish to exchange that suspicious safety which we owe to the good sense, to the remembrance rather than to the continuance of former affection, to the habit rather than to the feelings of past fidelity,—I wish to exchange that suspicious safety for the holiday security of a people's love. (Cheers.) There be some few, I know, in all political parties, who care neither for a people's love nor have faith in a people's gratitude; whose best political virtue is a proud consistency in wrong, and whose highest moral courage is an unreflecting security. (Hear, hear, hear.) Where, indeed, was ever seen a fabric of time-worn political privilege tottering to its fall, the majority of whose possessors have not displayed the same idiotic security, amidst the ruin which every one else foresaw. (Loud cheers.) I will not detain the House by quoting proofs of that melancholy truth; of which political history is but one long example; I will go no farther back than to the early days of many whom I now address, and ask was it the firmness of real or the madness of fancied security when the Court of Versailles drove the representatives of popular opinion to swear in a Tennis Court their own inviolability and the regene-



ration of France? (Hear, hear.) Or was it the firmness of real or the madness of fancied security when, as it were but yesterday, the breathless herald of approaching insurrection was ordered to wait on the threshold of St. Cloud

"*Donec Borbonico libeat vigilare tyranno.*"

(Hear, hear, hear.) What price, not the people of France alone, but all civilised Europe, were compelled to pay for chaining that first madness, is now matter of history; what price, not France alone, but all civilised Europe are about to pay for chaining this second madness, I dare not trust myself to prophesy (cheers); but I appeal to all impartial observers of past and passing events who have witnessed the reluctance with which that mighty people commenced the struggles for which they have paid so much, to say whether that people would not have repaid with a rich return of confidence and love, the voluntary sacrifice of antiquated power, worthless and defenceless though it was. (Hear, hear.) That such gratitude would have been felt by the people of France for such sacrifice, I do most sincerely believe; that such gratitude will be felt by the people of England for far less painful sacrifices I do most unhesitatingly affirm; (cheers) and the more gratitude, inasmuch as such sacrifices on our part are not yet inculcated by the presence of that other fearful alternative. (Cheers.) For the honour of this ancient monarchy, whose perils and whose triumphs for so many generations are chronicled in the proceedings of this House; for the sake of this faithful people who have stood by us in the hour of our trial, and borne with us in the hour of our pride, let us seize the opportunity which now presents itself, to inscribe ourselves on the page of history as the first recorded example of "power correcting its own usurpation." The hon. Gentleman resumed his seat amidst loud and general cheering.

### SEEDS

*For Sale at my Shop, Bolt-court, Fleet-street, London.*

**LOCUST SEED.**—Very fine and fresh, at 6s. a pound, received from America about two months ago. For instructions relative to sowing of these seeds, for rearing the plants, for making plantations of them, for preparing the land to receive them, for the after cultivation, for the pruning, and for the application of the timber; for all these see my "**WOODLANDS;**" or **TREATISE ON TIMBER TREES AND UNDERWOOD.** 8vo. 14s.

**SWEDISH TURNIP SEED.**—Any

quantity under 10lbs. 10d. a pound; any quantity above 10lbs. and under 50lbs. 9½d. a pound; any quantity above 50lbs. 9d. a pound; above 100lbs. 8½d. A parcel of seed may be sent to any part of the kingdom; I will find proper bags, will send it to any coach or van or wagon, and have it booked at my expense; but *the money must be paid at my shop before the seed be sent away*; in consideration of which I have made due allowance in the price. If the quantity be small, any friend can call and get it for a friend in the country; if the quantity be large, it may be sent by me. This seed was grown last year at Barn-Elm, on ridges six feet apart; two rows, a foot apart, on each ridge.

**MANGEL WURZEL SEED.**—Any quantity under 10lb., 7½d. a pound; any quantity above 10lb. and under 50lb., 7d. a pound; any quantity above 50lb., 6½d. a pound; any quantity above 100lb., 6d. a pound. The selling at the same place as above; the payment in the same manner. This seed was also grown at Barn-Elm farm, the summer before the last. It is a seed which is just as good at ten years old as at one.—The plants were raised in seed-beds in 1828; they were selected, and those of the deepest red planted out in a field of 13 acres, which was admired by all who saw it, as a most even, true and beautiful field of the kind.

**COBBETT'S CORN.**—I SELL THE CORN AT MY SHOP IN BOLT-COURT, AT 1s. A BUNCH OF FINE EARS, SIX IN NUMBER; and the Book, on the cultivation and uses of it, at 2s. 6d.; which is called a **TREATISE ON COBBETT'S CORN.**

*From the LONDON GAZETTE,  
FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 1831.*

**BANKRUPTCY SUPERSEDED.**  
MITCHELL, G., jun., Brighton, broker.  
**BANKRUPTS.**

GERRISH, W., Bristol, dealer.  
GUNNELL, R. G., and W. Shearman, Salisbury-square, Fleet-street, printers.

HALSON, A., George-town, Demerara, and Bridgewater-square, merchant.  
 MOFFETT, W., Great Bell-alley, Coleman-street, baker.  
 MOORE, T., Allbrihton, Shropshire, butcher.  
 SAXBY, T., Loughboro', lace-manufacturer.  
 TUCKER, C., Bartlett's-buildings, bronzist.  
 WELDON, E., Cambridge, butcher.

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1831.

#### INSOLVENT.

APRIL 19. — PAXTON, J., jun., Ironmonger-lane, Cheapside, linen-draper.

#### BANKRUPTCY SUPERSEDED.

HEEL, T., Gateshead Low Fell, Durham, draper.

#### BANKRUPTS.

ALLWRIGHT, J., Strand, and Wokingham, Berkshire, cheesemonger.

ARMSTRONG, J., Raskelf, Yorkshire, miller.

BARNETT, J., Devonshire-place, Old Kent-road, navy-agent.

CHALK, T. H., Barking, Essex, corn-dealer.

CLAYTON, M. and H., East Retford, Nottingham, drapers.

COUTTS, J., jun., Notting-hill, Kensington, baker.

CRITCHLEY, J., Ryeford, Gloucestershire, coal-merchant.

CRONIN, J., Old Bailey, stone-merchant.

DAVIS, J., King's-head-yard, Russell-street, & Hart-st., Covent-garden, orange-mercht.

FRANCIS, E. H., Wandsworth, Surrey, schoolmaster.

LEA, J., jun., Worcester, butcher.

MILLS, J., Clerkenwell-green, wine-mercht.

MONK, C. and T., Frome Selwood, Somersetshire, linen-draper.

NOVELL, W., Clapham-road, carpenter.

PLATT, T., Brentford, coal-merchant.

SMITH, R., William-street, New Kent-road, licensed victualler.

SMITH, G. and R. Foulerton, Gutter-lane, warehousemen.

WOOLSTON, J., Kingston-upon-Hull, toy-seller.

WRANGHAM, W., Louth, Lincolnshire, silversmith.

### LONDON MARKETS.

MARK-LANE, CORN-EXCHANGE, APRIL 18.—

Our arrivals, since this day se'nnight, of foreign wheat have been great; of English malt, English, Irish, and foreign oats and flour, English beans and foreign barley, moderately good; of English wheat and barley, English peas, English and foreign rye, and seeds from all quarters, very limited. This day's market having been numerously attended by both London and country buyers, together with the intelligence received this morning from the country signifying that the provincial markets were firm, and for the most part scantily supplied, and the sellers here seeming determined not to submit to Friday's depression, the trade, notwithstanding

the last week's immense arrivals of foreign wheat had raised in the millers expectations of purchasing at a reduced currency, was, throughout, tolerably brisk, with wheat, rye, malt, peas, and seeds, at last Monday's, with barley and oats at Friday's quotations, with beans at an advance of 2s. per quarter. Flour was, on account of a further great supply from America, dull of sale, but had not fallen in price at the time we left the market.

Wheat .....	60s. to 72s.
Rye .....	36s. to 42s.
Barley .....	30s. to 36s.
— fine .....	35s. to 46s.
Peas, White .....	38s. to 41s.
— Boilers .....	43s. to 48s.
— Grey .....	36s. to 40s.
Beans, Small .....	40s. to 48s.
— Tick .....	36s. to 44s.
Oats, Potatoe .....	27s. to 34s.
— Poland .....	27s. to 31s.
— Feed .....	24s. to 29s.
Flour, per sack .....	55s. to 60s.

#### PROVISIONS.

Bacon, Middles, new, 40s. to 45s. per cwt.
— Sides, new... 40s. to 44s.
Pork, India, new... 118s. 6d. to —s. 6d.
Pork, Mess, new... 63s. to 65s. 0d. per barrel
Butter, Belfast .... 78s. 82s. per cwt.
— Carlow .... 74s. to 84
— Cork .... 76s. to 82s.
— Limerick .. 82s. to 84s.
— Waterford 76s. to 94s.
— Dublin .... —s. to —s.
Cheese, Cheshire .... 50s. to 74s.
— Gloucester, Double.. 56s. to 62s.
— Gloucester, Single... 50s. to 60s.
— Edam .... 44s. to 58s.
— Gouda .... 42s. to 46s.
Hams, Irish..... 50s. to 60s.

SMITHFIELD—April 18.

This day's supply of beasts was rather great, of calves moderately good, of sheep, lambs, and porkers, limited. The trade was throughout very dull, with mutton at an advance of 2d., veal at a depression of from 2d. to 8d. per stone, with beef, lamb, and pork, at Friday's quotations. Beasts, 2,379; sheep and lambs, 15,500; calves, 120, pigs, 160.

#### THE FUNDS.

3 per Cent. }	Fri.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.
Cons. Ann. }	79½	87	79½	79½	79½	79½

MARK-LANE.—Friday, April 22.

The arrivals of Foreign Wheat are again large. The market is very dull at Monday's prices.